

TIME IN THE NOVELS OF MILOŠ CRNJANSKI

by David A. Norris, B.A.

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, May, 1989

## TIME IN THE NOVELS OF MILOŠ CRNJANSKI

### Abstract

### Part One

#### Chapter One

The Life and Literary Career  
of Miloš Crnjanski

1

### Part Two

#### Chapter Two

Sumatraism and Time

67

#### Chapter Three

The Early Novels:

Time, Language and Narrative Structure

104

#### Chapter Four

The Later Novels: Time and Voice

160

### Part Three

#### Chapter Five

Time and Self

215

#### Chapter Six

Time and History

276

#### Chapter Seven

Concluding Remarks

339

#### Bibliography

358

## ABSTRACT

### TIME IN THE NOVELS OF MILOŠ CRNJANSKI

This thesis is the first long work which focuses on the issue of time in Crnjanski's four major novels. It aims to demonstrate the complexity of time in his novels, in relation both to the organisation of narrative events, and to the characters' experience and perception of self. It shows ways in which Crnjanski's views on time are reflected in the language and construction of his novels.

Part One, Chapter One, outlines the life and literary career of Miloš Crnjanski. It views his work against the background of modernism, and locates him in Serbian literary history.

Part Two begins the discussion of time in Crnjanski's work in relation to his personal style known as sumatraism. Chapter Two focuses on two of his early essays, what they reveal about his approach to time, and identifies the principles of simultaneity and rhythm which characterise his thinking about time. The analysis emphasises time as a part of wider issues concerning language, the individual, values, and history in his novels. Chapter Three takes up the issue of time in relation to language and narrative structure in his early novels. Chapter Four continues the analysis of

time in relation to narrative structure, and particularly in relation to the orchestration of voice in his later work.

Part Three opens with discussion of major motifs in Crnjanski's novels which demonstrate the issue of identity as a constant theme. Chapter Five focuses on time in relation to identity and the problem of being-in-time as expressed in his first and last novels. Chapter Six continues the analysis of time and identity in his other two novels, viewing identity in the context of social institutions and history. Chapter Seven summarises the major conclusions arising from this analysis of time in Crnjanski's novels. The arguments presented are used to qualify statements concerning time in his novels which have been made by some commentators.



PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE

THE LIFE AND LITERARY CAREER OF MILOŠ CRNJANSKI

Introduction

Miloš Crnjanski is considered one of the most influential writers of this century to appear in Serbian literature. In the opening to his extensive article on Crnjanski's poetry and early work Radomir Konstantović wrote:

Sa Crnjanskim, srpska kultura došla je do punog izraza jednog romantizma kakvog dotle nije poznavala (1).

With Crnjanski, Serbian culture achieved the full expression of a Romanticism which it had not known before.

In both his prose and poetry Crnjanski is associated with the introduction of new and innovative writing in modern Serbian literature. His career spans over fifty years from his early poems published during the First World War to the appearance of his last novel, Roman o Londonu, in 1971 (2). Such was his standing that his notes for certain projects were collected together after his death and published posthumously, particularly the autobiographical Embahade and his work on Michelangelo, Knjiga o Mikelandelu (3). Crnjanski

first gained his reputation as a writer in Belgrade's literary circles during the period described by Palavestra as the second phase of Serbian modernism 1919-1929 (4). Poetry was the dominant genre of those years, and the lyrical nature of his two early novels, Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću and Seobe (5), led many critics to regard his work as that of a poet rather than a novelist:

Međuratni su kritičari Dnevnik i Seobe nazivali ili "lirskim" ili "poetskim" romanima, i pri tome su svakako imali na umu - verovatno više nego mi danas - da je ove romane napisao izraziti liričar (6).

Critics from between the wars termed Dnevnik and Seobe "lyrical" or "poetic" novels, and by that of course they had in mind - probably more than we do today - that these novels were written by an outstanding lyricist.

Petković's sentiment expressed in the above quotation has been echoed by others, and has not always been confined to the critics of those years. Pavle Zorić began his 1972 article "Struktura poetske proze Miloša Crnjanskog" with the statement:

Gotovo svi kritičari koji su pisali o romanima Miloša Crnjanskog isticali su njihove poetske kvalitete (7).

Almost all the critics who have written about the novels of Miloš Crnjanski have emphasised their poetic qualities.

Part of the purpose of this analysis is to consider Crnjanski's four major novels as part of a narrative opus in his life's work, with common thematic

preoccupations and characterised by Crnjanski's particular literary style. In addition to the three already mentioned the fourth novel to be the subject of this study is Druga knjiga seoba (8).

Little has been written about time in Crnjanski's work. In her introduction to the 1978 edition of his poetry Svetlana Velmar-Janković comments that

misao o smislu trajanja postaje kod ovog pesnika svest o potrebi da se to trajanje razbija i razloži (9).

thinking on the sense of duration becomes in the work of this poet an awareness of the need for the destruction and demolition of duration.

Radomir Konstantinović remarks that Crnjanski's poetry touches upon a realm where

svaka istorija prestaje, naša ljudska istorija, gde počinje jedno drugo, apsolutnije vreme, možda vreme bez vremena, možda vreme s one strane istorije (10).

each history ceases, our human history, where one other more absolute time begins, perhaps a time without time, perhaps time from the other side of history.

Criticism on Crnjanski's novels has tended to ignore their temporal complexity, and focus on the particular use of imagery. This view of his work has culminated in Petar Džadžić's book Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog, in which he emphasises the use of place imagery (11). The primary aim of this thesis is to present the first long study devoted to the question of time in his novels.

The novel has long been associated with what Mendilow described as the time arts which "represent actions evolving in sequences" (12). Gérard Genette has also written a long study of time in the novel in which he focuses on the arrangement of the events of a narrative in terms of their order, duration, and frequency (13). However, the starting point for this analysis will be Crnjanski's own comments on time in relation to language, literary style, and the meanings of history which he lights upon in two of his early essays, "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" and "Za slobodni stih" (14). Part One of this study outlines Crnjanski's life and literary career, giving a context to the conditions under which he wrote, his place in Serbian literature, and the European background of his work. This is a necessary component since so little is known of Crnjanski and Serbian literature outside Yugoslavia. Part Two discusses his treatment of time in relation to his use of language, narrative structure, and voice. Part Three examines the complex arrangements by which his characters see themselves as subjects which have an existence in, and develop through, time, and as subjects in the wider flow of historical events. The publication dates of his four major novels divide them into two chronological groups: the early novels Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću (1921) and Seobe (1929), the later novels Drugi knjiga seoba (1962) and Roman o Londonu

(1971). There are similarities and developments over the years, some of which cut across the chronological divide and bracket the novels in different groupings.

### Early Years

Crnjanski wrote a number of autobiographical books and articles which have provided the source material for information about his life in this section of the study. His views are often partisan, although this does not present a hindrance to establishing the facts of his whereabouts and his activities. Furthermore, his partisanship offers illuminating insights into the man himself and his attitudes towards his contemporaries. His first substantial autobiographical sketches appeared in the edition of his collected poems from 1959, Itaka i komentari (15). He wrote his commentaries because a number of his poems were of a political nature and so details about his life and "o tim prošlim vremenima" ("about those past times" 16) would help illuminate them. He wrote about his family, his childhood, war years, early literary experience, student days in Belgrade, until his return to Serbia following a short sojourn in France in 1921.

He was born in 1893 in Congrad, a town lying some forty miles north of the point where the present-day borders of Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia meet. At that time it was a city in the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

His father, Toma, was a clerk, whose first wife died leaving him with a son. His mother, Marina, was the daughter of an army officer from Pančevo. She was from a wealthier and more socially distinguished background than his father. These simple details of Crnjanski's birth have been confused by some who have described his early years. Nikola Drenovac conducted an interview with him, in which Drenovac stated that the author was born in Ilandža (17). In his more recent publication, Život Miloša Crnjanskog, Radovan Popović refers to Crnjanski's mother as "Marija", although the author himself calls her "Marina" in his commentaries (18).

In 1896 the family moved to Temišvar where there was a substantial Serbian population. From 1900 Crnjanski attended a Serbian elementary school, and from 1904 he attended the lycée, which was a Catholic piarist establishment. His father died in 1909, and his mother continued to bring up her son in some material difficulty but ensuring him a good education. In 1912 he rebelled against his family's wishes. His uncle on his mother's side was a businessman in Vienna who proposed that Crnjanski join him, enroll in the Export Academy, and train to take over his business affairs. Rather than go to Vienna, Crnjanski enrolled in the Export Academy in Rijeka, where, according to his own testimony, he was more interested in learning to fence and playing football for the local team, Viktorija.

than in his studies. The following year he received a second invitation to join his uncle in Vienna, which he accepted. Once he had enrolled in the Viennese academy, he changed course to study medicine, only to change again to the study of history and philosophy. He was in Vienna when the First World War broke out in 1914.

The assassination of the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife in Sarajevo on 28 June, 1914, sparked off a chain of events which led to the outbreak of war. The assassin, Gavrilo Princip, had enjoyed the support of the unofficial Serbian organisation dedicated to the overthrow of Habsburg rule, Ujedinjenje ili smrt. The organisation drew a large number of its members from officers of the Serbian army. Consequently, many Serbs who lived in the Habsburg Empire were detained by the authorities on suspicion of supporting the pro-Serbian groups. Crnjanski was not a member of any such organisation, but he too was arrested briefly. After the war, he clearly showed himself to be a Serbian patriot and claimed that he had always been so. Whatever Crnjanski's political affiliations were at this stage in his life, whatever he really felt towards independent Serbia and the future for the South Slavs under Habsburg rule, he was conscripted into the Habsburg army. He saw some action during the war on the Galician front, but spent the majority of his time behind the lines. He was diagnosed as suffering from

tuberculosis and sent to Vienna to convalesce in 1915. In the autumn of the following year he was assigned to non-military duties on the railways at Segedin, and then posted to a school for reserve officers in 1917. After the war, following the formation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, later to be called Yugoslavia, Crnjanski went first to Zagreb, and then to Belgrade.

Crnjanski published two poems as a young man in the period before the war. The first was "Sudba" which appeared in the youth journal Golub in 1908 (19), and the second was "U početku beše sjaj" which was published in the journal Bosanska vila in 1912 (20). He claims that the second poem was just one of a number which he sent to the journal. He also notes that he sent a play, Prokleti knjaz, to the Narodno pozorište and a novel to the journal Brankovo kolo (21). These others were not published and he did not keep any copies of his manuscripts. He found his first success with his poems of 1917 published by Julije Benešić, editor of the Croatian journal Savremenik (22). At that time the censor in Zagreb was particularly sensitive to any anti-war sentiments, and Benešić made some slight alterations to Crnjanski's manuscripts, such as changing the title of one poem from "Oda vešalima" to simply "Oda". These poems of 1917 and 1918 formed the basis for his later collection Lirika Itake (23). It was



his connection with Benešić which took him to Zagreb in 1918, where Benešić introduced him to the literary circles of the city. He met the editors of the journal Književni jug, and in particular Ivo Andrić. The journal had begun publication in January 1918 as a pro-Yugoslav organ, intent on promoting the union of the South Slavs in one state.

The cultural life of Belgrade had been severely disrupted by the war. The city had been the scene of much fierce fighting, being occupied and relieved twice, and had suffered great material damage. Furthermore, the Austrian authorities who had occupied Serbia pursued a policy aimed at crushing the national spirit of the Serbs as an independent people. It was recognised that the Serbs had sponsored discontented groups within the Empire during the decade leading up to the war, and were heavily implicated in the assassination of the archduke in 1914. History in schools was taught in a way which minimised the achievements of Serbia, cyrillic printing presses were smashed, journals ceased publication, and cultural life came to a virtual standstill with no literary works of value published. Many writers had left the country when the army retreated across Albania to find refuge on Corfu. After the war, the representatives of pre-war Serbian literature were dispersed and only slowly returned to Belgrade.

Belgrade had suffered much greater damage than the

Croatian capital of Zagreb during the war, and as a gesture of goodwill, and to help revitalise cultural life in Belgrade and Serbia generally, it was suggested that the publishing base of Književni jug be moved from Zagreb to Belgrade. Crnjanski took the proposition to the literary circles of Belgrade when he moved there in 1919. Arriving in Belgrade he had already gained a reputation as a poet because of his publications in Savremenik. The plan to move the publishing base of the journal to Belgrade failed. Crnjanski recalled in his 1929 essay "Posleratna književnost" that its origin in Zagreb reminded many Serbs of the Central European Powers against which they had so recently fought, particularly by its use of the Latin alphabet:

Latinica u Književnom jugu, koju smo bili primili kao nešto bratsko i hrvatsko, značila je u Beogradu, tada, nešto austrijsko, okupatorsko (ona je škodila docnije i Danu) (24).

The Latin alphabet in Književni jug, which we had accepted as something fraternal and Croatian, meant in Belgrade at that time something Austrian, connected with the occupation (it also damaged Dan later).

Crnjanski also mentions in the same essay that conditions in Belgrade were very bad and that most people's energies were concentrated on repairing the war damage:

O nekoj književnoj atmosferi, publici itd., tada se još u Beogradu nije moglo govoriti. Beograd još nije imao ni vode, ni osvetljenja, bio je upropašćen i ružan (25).

One could not speak yet of a literary ambience, public etc. in Belgrade. Belgrade did not yet have water, or lighting, it was in ruins and ugly.

However, his promotion of the journal in Belgrade put him in immediate contact with Serbia's literary circles. The cultural life of the city in the immediate aftermath of the war was fragmented, and Crnjanski was one of those who reinvigorated Belgrade as a cultural centre by his wide-reaching and active participation in Serbian literature of the 1920s.

Throughout his life the wider political events in Yugoslavia and Europe influenced Crnjanski's career as a novelist. His status as a Serb in the Habsburg Empire at the outbreak of war had given him early experience of the way in which the lives of individuals are affected by historical events beyond their control, and which could not be foreseen. Similarly, partisan victory after the Second World War obliged him to remain in exile in London for twenty five years before finally returning home. The events of his life help to explain his relative obscurity on the European literary scene. After the Second World War efforts were made to translate and publish the work of Yugoslav authors abroad but Crnjanski's uneasy relationship with the literary and political establishment in those years made them reluctant to promote his work. In the remainder of this chapter biographical information is coupled with a

wider perspective which places Crnjanski's work in the broader framework of literary history and European culture.

### Crnjanski Between the Wars

The major part of this section is devoted to Crnjanski and Serbian modernism. In addition to the role which he played in Belgrade's literary world during the twenties, particular attention is drawn to the way in which Crnjanski and critics have used the terms Romantic and lyric. These terms have contributed to the marginalisation of the study of time in his novels. This section also introduces Crnjanski's works of the period from 1919 to 1941 and Yugoslavia's involvement in the Second World War. A third feature of this section is the author's politics. His political stance during the thirties alienated him from many colleagues and supporters, and greatly influenced the shape of his life after the Second World War.

Crnjanski's earlier novels appeared during the most prolific period of the author's life, and one which is marked by his most intense involvement in the polemics of Belgrade's literary circles. His large output has earned him the reputation of the "središnja ličnost" ("central figure" 26) amongst the younger generation of post-war modernist poets in Belgrade. Although his reputation was first established by the appearance of

his collection of poems Lirika Itake in 1919.

Crnjanski had begun to write his first prose work.

Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, in the latter years of the war.

He writes in his commentaries how he spent the winter of 1918:

Zimu 1918. proveo sam kao u snu u selu.  
Skupljao sam pesme koje sam hteo  
da štampam u Beogradu i skupljao sam  
rukopis Dnevnika o Čarnojeviću, koji je  
bio narastao u debelu knjigu (27).

I spent the winter of 1918 as if in a  
dream in the village.

I collected together the  
poems which I wanted to print in Belgrade  
and I gathered together the manuscript of  
Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, which had grown  
into a thick volume.

His other major publications of this period include: a  
play in verse Maska, and a collection of short stories  
Priče o muškom. He also translated collections of  
Chinese and Japanese poetry from English and French, and  
wrote what is probably his most famous novel Seobe  
(28). He wrote other poems ("Sumatra", "Stražilovo",  
"Serbia"), articles and travelogues for newspapers and  
magazines, reviews, and literary criticism (29). In  
some of his essays Crnjanski expresses his own thoughts  
on literature and aesthetics, most notably in  
"Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" and "Za slobodni stih", which  
echo ideas similar to those found elsewhere in Europe.  
In Serbian literature the new literary styles and  
trends grouped together under the modernist banner began  
with the simultaneous arrival of symbolist and

parnassian influences in the 1890s as expressed in the poetry of Vojislav Ilić and Laza Kostić (30). The conflicting aesthetics of these two influences were associated with separate movements in France from decades earlier. Literary trends in Serbia were very much influenced by French patterns, and tended to be some years behind current practice and thinking in Paris. The trends which most influenced Crnjanski from the immediate pre-war period were the intimist strains in the poetry of Sima Pandurović and Vladislav Petković-Dis. During the second phase of modernism, after the First World War, Serbian literature reflected trends which were current elsewhere in Europe. Modernism as a literary period signalled Serbia's entry into the mainstream of European culture. Poetry remained the dominant genre, to which the use of language and range of theme in Crnjanski's early work contributed a great deal, paving the way for such poets as Rastko Petrović and Momčilo Nastasijević, and the surrealists such as Marko Ristić and Dušan Matić.

There are many features in the formation of cultural life in this period of Serbian literature which justify its designation as modernist in the European framework. Belgrade's polemical atmosphere mirrored events in major cultural centres. Small groups of writers and artists would gather together to promote one or other artistic trend or aesthetic theory. They would

debate with other groups who held different views, but the groups were fluid in their membership and would disappear as new trends and fashions made their appearance. The same writers and artists would soon re-appear in new alignments supporting other trends or ideas. Each group was characterised by its own magazine, written by members of the group and effectively financed by them as its subscribers. The twenties in Belgrade witnessed a large number of "little reviews" which performed the same functions as their counterparts in Europe and North America (31). Their pages were often polemical, and little more than manifestos for a new literary fashion. They were devoted to the new and the experimental in literature. Crnjanski contributed to many such journals, and worked as literary editor for Dan in 1919 (32).

Literary styles and poetic language in Europe changed quickly during the early years, with a variety of schools and trends. Expressionism, cubism, fauvism, imagism, surrealism, and many other movements appeared, which were "not... all movements of one kind" while some were "radical reactions against others" (33). It was the styles of expressionism and futurism which characterised Serbian modernism, as pointed out by Palavestra:

Futurizam i ekspresionizam dobijali su nova određenja i nove sadržaje. Te nove forme književne avangarde mogu se smatrati bitnim pretpostavkama

modernističke revolucije u prvim godinama posle prvog svetskog rata. (34)

Futurism and expressionism received new definition and content. These new forms of the literary avant-garde may be considered the essential suppositions of the modernist revolution in the first years after the First World War.

The bitter and angry tone of Crnjanski's poetry and early prose during the 1920s, with his scant regard for the normative rules of syntax and highly evocative language identifies much of his work with that of the expressionists. He made a specific reference to expressionism in an early article of 1919: "Ja ne razumem kako se može neko nazivati umetnikom, ko ekspresionista nije, ili što više znači nema moći da bude" ("I do not understand how someone can call himself an artist who is not an expressionist, or more to the point, does not have the ability to be one" 35). The general tendency is not to regard expressionism in Serbia as a school of literature, but as a general trend in experimentation with poetic language:

Ekspresionizam je u srpskoj književnosti bio manje književna škola, a više zvučan i prikladan naziv za način istupanja jednog književnog pokolenja (36).

Expressionism in Serbian literature was less a literary school, and more a resonant and appropriate title for the manner in which a literary generation declared themselves.

Crnjanski's work has much in common with European literature of the day, produced in an atmosphere similar to that of other cultural centres. He employed motifs



and a style similar to those used by many other poets and writers of the day, a factor noted by Flaker in his book Poetika osporavanja (37). And in his commentaries Crnjanski described himself as "tipični smetenjak" ("a typical scatterbrain" 38) of his age.

His essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" was written on behalf of the younger generation of poets and "najnovija umetnost" ("the newest art"). He added to his comment from 1919 on the significance of expressionism for Serbian modernism by noting the importance of futurism:

Ali da najnovija poezija nije ni ludorija, ni dekadentstvo, to će svaki uvideti, kad bude saznao za uticaj ruskih futurista, i "dekadenata", njinog, prefinjenog, časopisa koji se zove Mir iskustva, u ruskoj revoluciji.

But that the latest poetry is neither madness, nor decadence, everyone will see when they learn of the influence of the Russian futurists, and "decadents", and of their sophisticated journal called Mir iskustva, in the Russian revolution.

In the same essay Crnjanski emphasised everything that was new and dynamic in the work and aesthetic of the younger generation of poets, later to be called "herojsko doba Mladih, doba od 1920-1922..." ("the heroic period of the Young, the period from 1920-1922" 39):

Pale su ideje, forme i, hvala bogu, i kanoni.

Ideas, forms have fallen, so too thank God, have the canons.

Prekinuli smo sa tradicijom, jer se

bacamo, strmoglav, u budućnost. Odbacili  
smo bivše zakone.

We have broken with tradition, for we are  
hurling ourselves headlong into the  
future. We have cast aside the former  
laws.

The destruction of all old values and the apocalyptic sense of change expressed in the essay reflect the stance of the futurists and dadaists. There is an underlying nihilism in the desire to destroy all that has gone before and build again on the ruins of time. The dominant sense in this essay is of the startling, new and vital approach of the modernist generation in those years, which in itself proposes a particular vision of time. His essay "s pravom se smatra za manifest nove pesničke škole" ("is justifiably considered the manifesto of the new poetic school" 40).

On arriving in Belgrade in 1919 Crnjanski became closely involved with writers and artists who used to meet in the kafana of the Hotel Moskva. Representatives of the pre-war generation, such as Sima Pandurović, mixed with younger poets who were just embarking on their careers, such as Crnjanski. They formed a group dedicated to the discussion and dissemination of contemporary artistic trends, called simply the "Grupa umetnika" ("Group of Artists"), the first of its kind in post-war Belgrade, which Crnjanski recalled in "Posleratna književnost": "Pod velikim ogledalom, u prizemlju 'Moskve', bio je sto pesnika i

slikara koji su osnovali 'Grupu'" ("Under the large mirror on the ground floor of the 'Moskva', there was a table of poets and painters who founded the 'Group'" 41). This was Crnjanski's first involvement with the polemical atmosphere which characterised Belgrade's literary circles during the twenties. The "Group" did not survive long. Some left for Paris, which was regarded by the Serbian modernists as the mecca of the younger generation of poets and Europe's cultural centre. Crnjanski also spent a few months there before returning for military service, and to marry Vida Ružić on 10 November, 1921. The older poets, such as Sima Pandurović, split with the younger generation, as they found their more extreme views untenable and destructive.

Crnjanski also fuelled splits amongst the younger generation when he agreed to publish in the new series of Srpski književni glasnik. The journal was first published in 1901 and established itself as the major literary journal of the day. It ceased publication during the war, but re-appeared again under the editorship of Bogdan Popović in 1920. Popović was a professor at Belgrade University, a well-read and cultivated man, whose express intention was to raise the literary and cultural standards of Belgrade to match the levels of other European centres. Crnjanski recalls in his essay "Posleratna književnost" that some of the more

radical members of the group could not accept his decision to publish in what they regarded as an academic organ of the establishment. The liberal minded Popović intended from the beginning of the new series to continue his policy of reflecting all the artistic trends of the capital and to report on developments abroad (42). He published Crnjanski's poem "Sumatra", but the startling originality of the poem, which marked it as "a poem rather different from any published hitherto in Serbian" (43), prompted him to ask Crnjanski for an essay in which he could outline his views on literature and art, and provide an explanation of the poem to help the conservative reading public to understand it better. The appearance of the poem and essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" in the pages of Belgrade's most respected literary journal marked the arrival of the post-war generation and strengthened their voice in Belgrade's literary circles. It came to provide a forum for debate between the older and younger generations (44), and for the eventual acceptance of the new poets influenced by modernist European trends.

Popović's invitation to the younger poets to publish their work in Srpski književni glasnik did not signal the literary establishment's approval of their work. On the contrary, there were many critics bitterly opposed to the aesthetic sensibilities of the younger generation. Marko Car attacked the whole modernist

project in the post-war years for its desire to capture the new:

Jedna od najslabijih strana današnjeg naraštaja pisaca, to je jurenje za novim i originalnim pošto poto (45).

One of the weakest sides of today's generation of writers is their rush for the new and original at any price.

Branko Lazarević reserved much of what he felt to be undesirable in the poetry of the younger generation for Crnjanski himself, whom he accused of confusion (46). He considered Crnjanski's poetic language at best muddled, ridiculing him for his poetic images, and castigating him for his inversion of traditionally revered symbols of the family and national pride. However, even his fiercest critics had to admit that there was something in his poetry which at times touched a chord in them, but that something was difficult to define. By 1924 "the heated controversy as reflected in the periodical, subsided into mere references to the old and the new literature in general articles" (47). Rather than a debate won or lost, there had taken place a gradual acceptance of the new trends. Crnjanski himself had played a significant part in the process. He described his own aesthetic in terms which emphasised his affinity with the expressionist and futurist trends in Europe generally.

Crnjanski was one writer who himself contributed another "ism" to the plethora of minor artistic

movements at the end of the First World War. Following the publication of his poem "Sumatra" and the accompanying essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'", his views on art, aesthetics, and his personal literary style became known as sumatraizam (sumatraism). He was not the only figure to have a personal style associated with his name; there was Rade Drainac's hipnizam and Ljubomir Micić's zenitizam. However, unlike the others, whose styles tended to be short-lived and associated with the publication of one or other little review, the term sumatraism remained associated with Crnjanski throughout his literary career. During that period its implications underwent change, but these tend to have been changes in emphasis rather than fundamental changes in the views which he expressed during the period of Serbian modernism.

Thus far, it has been stressed that Crnjanski's early work was concerned with the all that was new in Serbian literature. His search for the new continued throughout his career, but became tempered with a respect for the traditions of Serbian literature. This other aspect of sumatraism has to be seen in the light of the ways in which the Serbian modernists used the terms Romanticism and lyric. The term Romanticism causes particular problems because of the longevity of the tradition amongst Serbian poets, which gave it a currency even into the 1890s, and which led to the

adoption of the term neo-Romantic for the poetry of modernism (48).

By the end of the twenties Crnjanski no longer spoke scornfully of everything that had preceded his generation. He recorded the change in his attitude in the essay "Posleratna književnost" in which he writes of what his generation introduced into Serbian literature:

Jedan nov stih u našoj književnosti, novu prozu, sasvim nove intenzije, različite od predratnih. Što je najbolje: povratak svome, pouzdanje u sebe, u svoje izvore (otuda simpatija za naš romantizam), u naše književne razloge, ne tražeći jednako zapadne kalupe (često plagijate), a noseći u sebe želju za književnim radom, bez akademskih marifetluka (49).

A new verse in our literature, a new prose, completely new intentions which differ from those of the pre-war period. And the best is: a return to what is our own, confidence in ourselves, in our origins (from that stems our sympathy for our Romanticism), in our literary goals, without constantly seeking Western models (often plagiarisms), and nursing within ourselves a desire for literary work without academic sleight of hand.

In addition to acknowledging the role of the Serbian Romantic tradition for post-war modernism, he also recognised the contribution made by some of the pre-war poets, especially Sima Pandurović. Although Pandurović's association with the younger poets was brief, Crnjanski recalled him as the "glavni teoretičar" ("chief theorist" 50) of the table around which the "Grupa umetnika" met. And he noted the particular significance which he attached to the contact between

the group and Bogdan Popović, who opened the pages of the establishment journal Srpski književni glasnik to them (51).

The empathy which Crnjanski felt for the poets of Serbian Romanticism, particularly the work of Branko Radičević, has not gone unnoticed by the critics. Aleksandar Petrov, in his book Poezija Crnjanskog i srpsko pesništvo, maintains that Crnjanski's poetry represents a break with previous poetry, but enters a qualification:

U pesničkom delu, međutim, on nastavlja jedan vid "sporedne" pesničke linije iz prethodne pesničke epohe, a oslonac traži u ranijoj tradiciji srpske poezije. Nova pesnička epoha Crnjanskovim delom obnavlja srpsku pesničku tradiciju od početka, zapravo od početka novije poezije (52).

In his poetic work, however, he continues one aspect of a "secondary" poetic line from the previous poetic era, while searching for support in an earlier tradition of Serbian poetry. The new poetic era as exemplified by Crnjanski's work renews the Serbian poetic tradition from the beginning, from the very beginning of modern poetry.

The beginning of modern poetry to which Petrov here refers is marked by the appearance of Branko Radičević and early Serbian attempts to create a modern poetic language where the models of folk poetry dominated. Crnjanski recorded his affinity with Radičević in an interview with Ljuba Vukmanović in 1967 (53). For Crnjanski poetry after the First World War was creating a new poetic diction, hence his empathy with the



struggle of the early Romantics.

The connection between modernism and the Romantics has been commented on in the West too. Edmund Wilson described modern symbolist poetry as "not merely a degeneration or an elaboration of Romanticism, but rather a counterpart to it, a second flood of the same tide" (54). In the approach of the modernists Bradbury and McFarlane point to a similar link in that "the intense subjectivity of the Romantic school remains central to the modern arts" (55). For Crnjanski, Romanticism was a term which was evocative of the new in Serbian literature, a reaction against the dead hand of language as practised by many of the pre-war generation. When speaking about his affinity with the Romantics in an interview with Branimir Ćosić in 1926 he remarked:

Našoj je književnosti potreban pre svega jedan dubok romantizam. To znači vraćanje njenim književnicima, od sociologa, filologa i uča koji su avansovali u poznavaoce potreba srpskog naroda (56).

Our literature needs above all a deep Romanticism. That means a return to our writers, away from the sociologists, philologists and pedagogues who have been projected as the experts of the needs of the Serbian people.

Crnjanski's call is for literature to be taken out of the hands of its critics, who have no feeling for the intrinsic value of literature. His call is for a return to writers as the source of inspiration and meaning of literary works, and for it to be taken out of the hands

of those whose purpose is to attempt to explain meaning. For Crnjanski, the most effective language was one which aimed at expressiveness and originality. In reference to the work of Laza Kostić, a pre-war poet who was closely connected with the transition from Romanticism to modernism in Serbian poetry, he remarked:

Bezbrojni novi izrazi, ritmovi i reči u tim stihovima pripadaju samo tom pesniku, iako su sasvim u duhu tog ogromnog talasa omladinskog shvatanja života (57).

Countless new expressions, rhythms and words in the verses belong only to that poet, although they are completely in the spirit of that huge wave of Young Serbian concept of life.

The connection between modernism and Romanticism in Crnjanski's work is not a continuity of the same historical period, but an indication of the reworking of previous styles and themes, as pointed out by Predrag Palavestra:

Pesnički rad i romansijski rad Miloša Crnjanskog pripadaju istom jedinstvenom duhovnom i stvaralačkom opredeljenju, i neodvojivi su jedan od drugoga. Našavši se, posle prvog svetskog rata, na čelu prevratničkih knjiženih pokreta, Crnjanski je, ne prekidajući liniju koju su pre njega naznačili Laza Kostić i Vladislav Petković-Dis, razvio novu, osveženu romantičarsku struju u srpskoj poeziji i svojom pojavom obeležio konačan raskid sa starom pesničkom školom dekorativnog sjaja i artizma (58).

The poetic work and novelistic work of Miloš Crnjanski belong to the same unique spiritual and creative trend, and they are inseparable one from the other. Finding himself, after the First World War, at the head of the rebellious literary movements, Crnjanski, without

discontinuing the line which Laza Kostić and Vladislav Petković-Dis had pointed before him, developed a new, refreshed Romantic current in Serbian literature, and with its appearance he signalled the final rupture with the old poetic school of decorative splendour and art for art's sake.

Crnjanski's break with the "old poetic school" is a break with the continuity of Romanticism as a period in literary history. Radomir Konstantinović has been more forceful in celebrating the continuity of the "spirit" rather than the historical evolution of the Romantic element in Crnjanski's work, which he terms "novoromantizam" ("neo-Romanticism"):

Njegov novoromantizam nije obnova srpskog romantizma, jer otvara romantičarsku stvarnost, duševnu i duhovnu, kakva je dotle bila savršeno nepoznata; neki naglasci srpskog romantizma produžavaju se i kroz Crnjanskog, kroz njegov jezik u najvišim njegovim ostvarenjima, pre svega u poemi "Stražilovo", ali duh ovog njegovog novoromantizma je duh radikalnog prevrata, savršeno novi duh, ili duh savršeno nove slobode, dotle nepoznate, i valjda dotle i nemoguće (59).

His neo-Romanticism is not the revival of Serbian Romanticism, for it discloses a Romantic reality, in spirit and in temper, which was completely unknown until then; some accents of Serbian Romanticism continue through Crnjanski, through his language in some of his greatest creations, above all in his poem "Stražilovo", but the spirit of his neo-Romanticism is the spirit of radical revolution, a completely new spirit, or a spirit of completely new freedom, unknown until then, and probably even impossible until then.

Slobodan Marković specifies the Romantic contradictions of "pobuna i nežni lirizam" ("rebellion and tender

lyricism" 60) as the spirit which guides Crnjanski's style. But, for Crnjanski rebellion and lyricism were complementary notions.

Crnjanski's two novels of the early period are the ones which have most frequently been described as lyrical. In an interview with Pavle Zorić in 1970 Crnjanski was asked about the "lirski faktor" ("lyrical factor") in these novels and he replied:

Pa, ne slažem da se preovlađuje. Ima u Dnevniku, i ima u Seobama, da ostalo i ne spomijem, i naturalizma i realizma, pa ako hoćete, i suve proze. Ono što vi nazivate intimni lirski ton ja bih voleo da priznate kao originalnost. To je taj lirski faktor (61).

Well, I don't agree that it (the lyrical factor DN) dominates. There is in Dnevnik, as there is in Seobe, not to mention the others, both naturalism and realism, also, if you like, dry prose. That which you call the intimate lyrical tone I would like you to recognise as originality. That is the lyrical factor.

Crnjanski links lyricism with originality, both of which are products of what is regarded in Serbian literature as a Romantic tendency. The use of these terms in relation to Crnjanski's work in general and to his novels in particular are not entirely to be taken at their face value as terms in literary history or as descriptions of literary genres. They correspond to the intentions which underly Crnjanski's sumatraist style in the Serbian tradition of the European framework of modernism in the decade after the First World War.

There are two conclusions to be drawn at the end of

this discussion on the use and meanings of the term Romanticism and lyric in Crnjanski's work. The first is that Crnjanski's affinity with Romanticism and the lyric have unfairly intruded on discussion of time in his novels. Romanticism was a historical period in which poetry was the dominant genre, and Crnjanski's first reputation was as a poet. His novels tend to be described as lyrical or poetic, as described by Petković and Zorić in the introduction to this chapter, and it has long been accepted that such novels transcend temporal ordering:

A lyrical novel assumes a unique form which transcends the causal and temporal movement of narrative within the framework of fiction. It is a hybrid genre that uses the novel to approach the function of a poem. Not surprisingly, the expectations of a reader who has been brought up on more traditional standards for the novel are often frustrated, for the symbolic patterns he encounters seem to him antithetical to the very method on which narrative is built (62).

Consequently, his novels are discussed with little reference to time. The second is that there exists a tension in Crnjanski's work between two approaches to time and history, both of which are evident in European modernism generally. His futuristic vision of abrupt change in sensibility which he expressed in "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" corresponds to what Poggioli describes as "a construction of the present and future not on the foundations of the past but on the ruins of time", while Crnjanski's later acknowledgement of the affinity

between his generation and earlier movements corresponds more to another modernist version of time, which Poggioli describes as

a humanistic version of the notion of modernity, for example, conceived of as a return, at once spontaneous and willed, to eternal values, long forgotten or buried but which a reborn or renewed historical memory makes once again present (63).

This duality in Crnjanski's views towards history and time is characteristic of his whole outlook on the question of time and narrative in his novels.

During the twenties and thirties Crnjanski published the two early novels which form part of the subject matter of this thesis, and other longer prose works too. Dnevnik o Černojeviću is written as a diary of the memories of a soldier returned home from the First World War. His mother has died, he has tuberculosis, his marriage has failed, and the confessional tone of his diary is an attempt to come to terms with his life and its meaning. He recalls events and scenes from the war, and from much further back in time, layering his memories with references to Serbian history and mythology. His recollections are presented as a chaotic series of memories and thoughts with no chronological order, but there are suggestions of personal and private connections between the disparate memories in the narrator's mind. This contributes to the dreamy nature of much of the narrative, and to the

impression that the confession is a reluctant attempt to face reality. The escape into dream is a feature of the work. The narrator's preoccupation with the past and the apparently chaotic temporal organisation of the text provide the initial justification for analysis of time in this novel.

Crnjanski's second novel, Seobe, is very different in its temporal organisation. It presents a more orderly representation of events, but there exists an underlying tension. The novel concerns the Serbs who had migrated to southern Hungary at the end of the seventeenth century. They were welcomed by the Habsburg authorities and given land in return for their services as frontier guards defending the border against the Ottoman Empire. The Serbs are presented as natural soldiers, who found that their service to the Empire coincided with their own desire to fight the Turks, and to liberate their homeland. The novel takes up their story in the middle of the eighteenth century when the threat to the Empire came from the continental powers in the West, where the Serbian regiments are ordered to march against the French. For the regimental commander, Vuk Isaković, the war has nothing to do with him as a Serb, and he feels that he is fighting for someone else's cause. To make matters worse, he is under pressure to convert to Catholicism as the price he must pay for promotion. When Vuk departs he leaves his wife

behind in the care of his brother, Arandel. Vuk has grown tired of his wife, Dafina, but Arandel has developed an obsessive desire for her. They sleep together one night, and the following day Dafina falls and dies from her injuries. The novel traces the developments in two loci of action, Vuk away at the war, and Arandel with Dafina in Zemun. Connections are made between the characters, separated as they are by great distances. Vuk is frequently described in introspective moods indicating that, like the narrator in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, he has reached a point when he is questioning his purpose and direction in life.

In addition to these novels of the early period, the author published or began to write others. The first such novel has only recently been rediscovered. It is a detective story, Podzemni klub, written by Crnjanski as a quick way of earning money, but published as a translation of an original novel by Harald Johnsson (64). It was published in Pančevo and intended for a popular fiction market. It is of no interest for this thesis as it contributes nothing to a discussion of time in Crnjanski's novels. It has been suggested by Vičezoslav Hronjec in Književne novine that the novel may indeed be a translation, as a novel by the same author under the same title appeared in Hungarian in 1920 (65). The next novel, Suzni krokodil, was never completed, and only four instalments appeared in Srpski



književni glasnik (66). His third novel was Kap španske krvi (67). Like Podzemni klub, it contributes nothing to a discussion of time in Crnjanski's novels, and is a historical costume drama. Crnjanski later claimed that the book was plagiarised for the film Lola Montez, although this has been disputed by Branko Aleksić since there are many sources on which the film could have relied (68). Critics have paid scant attention to these novels, regarding them on the whole as inferior to the four major works with which this analysis is concerned. Only Crnjanski himself had any regard for his novel Kap španske krvi (69). He continued to publish during the 1930s, but increasingly these were items for the popular press or travelogues. In 1934 he published a biography of the the first Serbian archbishop, Saint Sava (70).

In order to put into perspective the events of Crnjanski's life after the Second World War it is necessary to say something about the author and the political stance which he adopted in Yugoslavia before the war. In Crnjanski's poetry and prose written during and after the First World War there is a great deal of anger, bitterness, and cynicism. Crnjanski was a typical product of the so-called lost generation who experienced at first hand the horrors of modern warfare. His poetry was rebellious and full of scorn at the literary and social establishment. He spoke of

socialism, and allied himself to the left wing of his generation. His innovative and startling poetry was the literary manifestation of a political radical. However, Crnjanski's commitment to socialism is to be suspected. In his poetry he rails against the status quo in favour of the "narod" ("narod" is a word which evokes the nation as a community, it may be translated as either "people" or "nation"), adding a populist tone to his verses.

Radical populism, based on a national ideal of the people, is not a substitute for socialism's focus on the oppression of one class by another. Crnjanski never discusses the politics of the class struggle, nor places the wrongs against the people in a historical context, and there is no evidence to support a claim that Crnjanski was ever committed to international socialism. He himself does claim that he was a socialist in his commentaries, but not that he was particularly committed:

Ja sam se bio deklarirao, javno, tada, za socijalistu, i bio sam to praktično, ali nisam ispunjavao, strogo, svoju dužnost partijsku. Odlazio sam, često, na pivo i večeru, u takozvani "Radnički dom", na Slaviji, ali šefove stranke nisam mario (71).

I had publicly declared myself a socialist then, and so I was to all practical purposes, but I was not zealous in fulfilling my party obligations. I would often go for a beer and dinner to the so-called "Radnički dom", at Slavija, but I did not care for the party bosses.

His recollection of his interest in matters of party policy is weak, but he did shed some light on his political stance in an interview with Milan Komnenić for Delo in which he spoke of his more general attitudes at the time:

Ono što sam ja govorio, nazivajući sebe u šali, "Je suis un anarchiste" - to je bila, ne poza, nego generacija. Cela generacija, tih vremena, bila je slična meni i ja njoj. Mi smo imali tu ljudsku hrabrost (72).

That which I used to say, declaring in jest, "I am an anarchist" - that was not a pose, but my generation. The whole generation of those times was similar to me, and I to it. We had that human courage.

Socialism and anarchy were attractive to Crnjanski for their rebellion against the status quo, and their ability to shock bourgeois society. His commitment, in the period before he allied himself with nationalist and Pan-Slavist groups, has been described as temporary by Radovan Vučković (73). Crnjanski's early contact with Bogdan Popović and publications in the journal Srpski književni glasnik is evidence that from the an early point his ardour for the rebellious avant-garde was tempered with "aristokratski konzervativizam i građanska koncepcija umetnosti" ("an aristocratic conservatism and bourgeois conception of art" 74). Crnjanski's commitment to the aims of socialism seems to have been confined to an emotive feeling. But, by the end of the decade he was associated with right-wing opinion.

During the 1920s a group of writers oriented towards left-wing politics appeared in Belgrade. Some of Crnjanski's early admirers and young followers, for example Milan Dedinac and Marko Ristić, formed the first surrealist circle in Belgrade in 1924. Like the surrealists in France they embraced communism. By the end of the decade some of them left the surrealist camp and formed a group, intending to introduce into their literary work a more direct literary expression of their political concerns in concrete and specific situations. Their interest was in "socijalna literatura" ("socially committed literature"). Crnjanski attacked this group for its political orientation.

He began his attack against them in a veiled complaint about the large number of foreign books available compared to those of Serbian authors. He singled out Milan Bogdanović for criticism, editor of Srpski književni glasnik and editor in the publishing house Nolit. Bogdanović countered Crnjanski's criticism, and the debate continued as they each published their statements and counter-statements in the pages of the daily press. The exchanges, begun as a series of public letters in March 1932, finished in court a few months later, when Bogdanović sued Crnjanski for libel and slander (75). Crnjanski's actions and comments against Bogdanović were personal and insulting. He claimed that Bogdanović received money from abroad.

and that he used his position in Srpski književni glasnik to favour Nolit. Many writers from Belgrade and other parts of Yugoslavia signed public letters deploring Crnjanski's behaviour. The court found in Bogdanović's favour and Crnjanski was fined. The author's attack on the left-wing groups of writers in Belgrade as an expression of his sharpened right-wing populism continued.

From 1921 he was employed as a teacher, firstly in Pančevo, and then in Belgrade (76). However, he was frequently absent from school in order to pursue his career as a writer, sometimes travelling in Yugoslavia and abroad to write travelogues for the press. Teaching provided an additional source of income, and by the end of the decade he had decided to enter the diplomatic service as a press attaché, a post which was semi-official and paid by the government. He was not the only writer of the period to pursue a diplomatic career: his friend Ivo Andrić had a successful career as a diplomat for the Yugoslav government. Crnjanski was posted to the embassy in Berlin, a period of his life which he describes in the first part of his memoirs published after his death, Embahade. In addition to the official documents and reports which he prepared for government departments, he continued to submit articles to the press. During the Spanish Civil War he reported from Franco's headquarters. Describing the Spanish

leader as "militarista u najboljem smislu reči" ("a militarist in the best sense of the word") he further enraged many back home in Yugoslavia by his articles in which he praised the experience of war as one of upliftment, which brought him into particular conflict with Miroslav Krleža (77).

Although frequently absent from Belgrade because of his diplomatic duties Crnjanski began publication of another journal, Ideje, in 1935. The journal has been described as fascist, although he published the work of many writers, including Ivo Andrić. Towards the end of the 1930s he was posted to the embassy in Rome, where he became acquainted with many leading members of Mussolini's fascist government. He describes his experiences in his memoirs, Kod Hyperoborejaca, including his opposition to and dislike of the government's anti-semitic policies. He was in Rome when war broke out between Yugoslavia and the Axis Powers. Crnjanski's politics were not guided by overt interest in the detail of doctrine. His tendency towards radical populism at the end of the First World War has been identified by some as socialist, but by the end of the first decade after the war he was firmly placed on the right. His willingness to accept fascism is not synonymous with support for fascist ideology, and he did not translate his nationalism into chauvinist terms at the expense of, for example, the Croats (78).

His entry into political debates had an effect on the way in which he was regarded by many who had been associated with him in the early 1920s. Both Milan Bogdanović and Marko Ristić had been admirers of his work after the First World War. However, his sympathy for right-wing politics led them to re-evaluate their earlier opinions both of Crnjanski and of Serbian modernism generally. In his 1934 essay "Slom posleratnog modernizma" Bogdanović described the post-war modernists as dilettantes "bez jasnoga stava" ("without a clear stance" 79), and their poetic revolution as nothing but "bektvo od života" ("an escape from life" 80). Both he and Ristić recognised a parallel between the styles of the Serbian modernists and the Italian futurists. In his essay "Protiv modernističke književnosti" Ristić associated the formal features of Crnjanski's free verse with fascism in an aside directed at Marinetti's remark "reči u futurističkoj - čitaj sada u fašističkoj - slobodi" ("words in futurist - now read fascist - freedom" 81). Ristić's implication of Crnjanski's fascist leanings is unfair since Crnjanski recognised the influence of the Russian futurists in his own essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'". Crnjanski's opponents could do little against him in the days of royal Yugoslavia. Power and social consensus were not on their side, but after the Second World War they had both in their grasp and

Crnjanski was obliged to remain in exile for a long period while he was persona non grata with the communist regime.

### The Post-War Years

Crnjanski was press attaché to the Yugoslav embassy in Rome, when Germany bombed Belgrade and Yugoslavia was drawn into the Second World War on 6 April, 1941. He was now an alien in an enemy country, but the diplomatic immunity normally accorded to embassy staff was respected by the Italian authorities. He and his wife were obliged to leave, along with the rest of the embassy staff, with whom they travelled to Lisbon, and from there to England where they arrived on 21 August, 1941. On arrival in Bristol, Crnjanski was immediately questioned by two detectives and a young army officer. In Embahade he suggests that he was under some suspicion because of his contact with the Italian authorities:

Sve knjige, sve papire mi oduzimaju.  
Lome cigarete koje nalaze u koferu u  
jednom porte cigarettes. Valjda misle  
da pesnici meću u cigarete špijunske  
izveštaje?

Ja imam diplomatski pasoš, i  
protestujem, ali oni rade svoj posao  
sasvim flegmatično. Docnije, svi su mi  
papiri vraćeni, u redu.

Ispituju me naročito o mojim  
poznanicima u Rimu, - i o grofu Čanu...

Oni me onda pitaju, a u kakvom  
sam odnosu bio prema grofu Čanu?

Velim, u činovničkom, prema svome  
rangu (82).



They took all my books and papers. They broke the cigarettes which were in the suitcase in a cigarette case. They probably thought that poets put their espionage information into cigarettes?

I held a diplomatic passport, and I protested, but they did their work quite phlegmatically. Later, all my papers were returned to me, in order.

They questioned me, particularly about my acquaintances in Rome, and about Count Ciano...

Then they asked me what was my relationship with Count Ciano?

I said, official, in accordance with my rank.

He delivers his recollections of that interview in a bitter tone. That initial interview and the distrustful attitude he encountered in England served to make him feel all the more uncomfortable in a country in which he was to stay for twenty five years.

During the war he worked for the Yugoslav government-in-exile in London. His position was not of political significance in that he continued working in the information office, but he was now a full official of the government. His link with the government during the war confirmed the opinion of his enemies that he was a royalist and anti-communist, while their vitriolic attacks against him confirmed Crnjanski in his belief that danger waited for him if he returned home after the war. The partisan victory during the Second World War brought the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to power. The communists set the terms of their government by establishing Yugoslavia as a people's republic, and in the early years conducted campaigns against all who were

considered counter-revolutionaries.

Many of the writers and critics whom Crnjanski had attacked for their political views in the 1930s were now in positions of power. He was denounced for the views which he had expressed before the war, and particularly for his launching of the journal Ideje (83). His work was excluded from official publications, and his contribution to the development of Serbian literature in the twentieth century ignored. The campaign of vilification against him reached its peak in Marko Ristić's article "Tri mrtva pesnika", which appeared in 1954 (84). Ristić was an important political figure, having been ambassador in Paris for the new Yugoslav state from 1945 to 1951. In his article he reflects on the life and work of three poets: Rastko Petrović, Paul Eluard, and Miloš Crnjanski. The first two were dead, and he expressed admiration for their achievements. He could not hide admiration for Crnjanski's work too, but he considered that since 1929 and the publication of Seobe, Crnjanski had been artistically sterile and pro-fascist.

Crnjanski was not without his supporters amongst the Belgrade intelligentsia. After 1948 when relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet union broke down, the nature of the communists' approach to government began to change. They ceased using the state apparatus as an instrument of coercion and relaxed their hold over many

areas of social and cultural life. The questioning of official views and accepted practices became more common. In this atmosphere, the pressure to rehabilitate Crnjanski grew. In 1952, Zoran Mišić defended Crnjanski's reputation as a poet in an article "O smislu i besmislu" (85). The debate about Crnjanski has continued, although his political stance has come to occupy a less central position. His behaviour in the late twenties and thirties, which involved him in a number of court cases, was less important to those who were not directly involved. Concern was increasingly focused on Crnjanski's literary value and his outstanding contribution to Serbian literature this century. Predrag Palavestra published an article in 1959 defending Crnjanski's reputation as a poet (86). He noted that after the official sponsorship of socialist realism by the communist authorities immediately after the war, younger poets of the mid- and late 1950s were turning to the modernist poets of Crnjanski's generation for models. He entitled his article "Jedan živi pesnik", playing on the caustic title of Ristić's earlier condemnation of Crnjanski. Book-length studies of his work since then have been written by Nikola Milošević, Aleksandar Petrov, Petar Džadžić, Slavko Leovac, Novica Petković, Stevka Šmitran, and two collections of essays devoted to his work have been published (87).

While in exile Crnjanski published a collection of some of his earlier poetry in Paris in 1954 (88). His two novels Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću and Seobe were published in Yugoslavia in 1956 (89), a sign of the growing rehabilitation of Crnjanski's reputation as a writer at home. A new play, Konak, about the murder of King Alexander and his wife Draga in 1903 was published (90). A new poem, "Lament nad Beogradom", was published in 1962 in Književne novine (91). Most of his original post-war works can be divided into autobiographical works and novels. The autobiographical writings are to be found in Itaka i komentari, covering his early years, Kod Hyperborejaca, and the posthumous Embahade (92). Kod Hyperborejaca contains a mixture of genres (93), but is based on his memories of his experiences as a press attaché in the Yugoslav embassy in Rome during the years leading up to the Second World War. Interwoven into the text are a number of references to a trip he made to Spitzbergen, a few years before his posting to Rome. There is a complex temporal structure in which he writes about 1939 to 1941 in Rome from the vantage point of 1965, and of 1937 in Spitzbergen from the vantage point of 1939 to 1941. However, the mixture of fact and fantasy is dominated by the autobiographical nature of the work which excludes it from this study. Embahade is contained in two volumes which cover in four parts

Crnjanski's memoirs from Berlin 1928-1929, and 1935-1938, his posting to Rome, and the war- and post-war years in London. In the last part the editors have incorporated much material which Crnjanski collected on historical and contemporary British attitudes towards Serbia. His bitterness about much of what happened to him in London is particularly evident in this part.

In London, Crnjanski became estranged from the émigré community, and he and his wife faced many disappointments. He records in Embahade a number of incidents in which he felt that his sense of self-worth was challenged. He had an argument with the Slavist Elizabeth Hill over the quality of the BBC's broadcasts to Yugoslavia. He faced another disappointment when he was turned down for a lectorship at Cambridge University. For a brief period Crnjanski and his wife were forced to accept the hospitality of Lady Padget, but left when they felt that she was treating them like servants.

He tried to make a living as a writer. He began a novel called The Shoemakers (94), but the attempt was unsuccessful because Crnjanski never mastered English sufficiently for the task. But, this novel which he attempted to write in English formed the basis for his novel eventually published as Roman o Londonu. Having attended an extra-mural course at the University of London in international law, trade and history, he

contributed articles on English politics to a journal published by Milan Stojadinović in Buenos Aires. Stojadinović was a former prime minister of Yugoslavia and proprietor of one of the Belgrade newspapers, Vreme, for which Crnjanski had been a contributor before the war. In 1951 he was elected the first President of the Association of Serbian Writers in London, a post which he did not occupy for long, as he quarrelled with other members, and he left the association in 1953.

Crnjanski was forced to take a number of jobs in London which he considered to be demeaning, given his previous reputation as one of Serbia's foremost literary figures, his diplomatic experience, and the general lifestyle which he had enjoyed until then. He worked as a book-keeper in a shoe shop in Bond Street, and later as a deliveryman for a book shop. He was approached on a number of occasions to return to Yugoslavia, by Moša Pijade for example in March 1957 (95), but he was still afraid of what might happen to him if he returned. From the early sixties he was a visitor to the Yugoslav embassy in London where he was befriended by the ambassador, Prica, and his wife. He finally returned to Yugoslavia in 1965, convinced by the overtures from old friends and by the growing critical acclaim with which his work met in Belgrade. An undoubted stimulus was the publication of his new novel, Druga knjiga Seoba, in

1962.

Far from being persecuted, Crnjanski was greeted as the culmination of Serbian literature in the modernist period and the forerunner of much which had influenced writers in this century. He was awarded a prize by the Association of Writers of Serbia for his life's work in 1971, and the following year received another prize from the respected weekly journal NIN when his work Roman o Londonu was voted novel of the year. The author attended numerous literary functions, gave many lectures, and was frequently praised by writers, critics, and the reading public. He lived in Belgrade until his death on 30 November, 1977. He and his wife had no children, and after her death she left a legacy to establish the Miloš Crnjanski Foundation in 1980. Nikola Milošević was the first president of the Foundation, with premises in the National Library in Belgrade for a small secretariat and archive. Its purpose is to promote the publication of Crnjanski's works and encourage critical accounts of his life and work.

Crnjanski's two later novels were published during this period, Druga knjiga seoba in 1962, and Roman o Londonu in 1971. It is difficult to date precisely when they were written. Druga knjiga seoba was certainly begun before the war, albeit in a different form from the final version, while the second novel was

to have been written in English. They were both largely written while in exile. They represent changes, developments, and continuities from his earlier novels.

In his Kod Hyperborejaca Crnjanski mentions a change in his thinking about time:

Kad bi me žena zapitkivala, o prošlosti u Firenzi, odgovarao bih, podrugljivo, da o vremenu mislim onako, kako nas Bergson uči. Sad mislim kao Jaspers (96).

When my wife used to question me about the past in Florence, I would reply, mockingly, that I thought about time in those terms which Bergson taught us. Now I think like Jaspers.

This study does not examine the developments in Crnjanski's novels as a comparison between the ideas of Bergson and Jaspers. Crnjanski has left behind few references to Bergson, and the philosopher's influence on Crnjanski's thinking can be categorised as no more than was typical of his age. He has left behind just this one reference to the work of the philosopher Karl Jaspers. However, in his novels there is an identifiable development in his representation of time as he becomes increasingly concerned with questions of identity and history.

As the title of Crnjanski's third novel, Druga knjiga seoba, suggests, it is in some ways a sequel to the earlier novel Seobe. The author takes up the story of the Isaković family some years on. Three nephews of Vuk Isaković and the main character, his adopted son Pavle, face disciplinary charges in the



Habsburg army. They led disturbances amongst the Serbian soldiers on hearing of the Empire's decision to disband their regiments. The cousins regard the move as a further sign of Habsburg pressure on them to forsake their national identity. The cousins see their only solution in emigration to Russia. Like Vuk, the cousins have an idealistic vision of Russia, seeing it as a utopia where they will be able to live their lives as Serbs. The issue becomes more than a question of national identity: it is vital for them to live in accordance with their conceptions of what and who they are. After their arrival in Russia they are quickly disillusioned as pressure mounts from the Russian authorities to conform and accept Russian identity. The novel continues the saga of the Serbs begun in Seobe, but they are very different novels in their structure. In the second novel there are many more characters, and there is more action, adding an epic flavour which the first novel lacks.

There is a gap of some thirty years separating the publication of this novel from the first. The interval lends credence to Ristić's attack that Crnjanski was artistically sterile. There is another factor which explains the long gap between the two novels, arising from Crnjanski's first intentions for his project. Seobe was published in serial form in Srpski književni glasnik before 1929, and was probably

substantially finished by 1927. The original plan was to write a six-volume work in which Crnjanski would trace the history of the Serbs, as he revealed in an interview with Anđelko Vuletić:

Kad je Milan Bogdanović počeo da štampa Seobe, u Srpskom književnom glasniku, znao je da imam program za 6 knjiga Seoba. Znao je i to tocum factum tog časopisa u to doba - Slobodan Jovanović. Znao je i moj prijatelj tog doba - Marko Ristić (97).

When Milan Bogdanović began to publish Seobe in Srpski književni glasnik, he knew that I had a plan for six volumes of Seobe. Also the tocum factum (factotum) of the journal in those days knew it - Slobodan Jovanović. And my friend of that time knew - Marko Ristić.

Each volume was to describe a different high point in the fate of the Serbs who had migrated to southern Hungary at the end of the seventeenth century, including their emigration to the Russian Empire, and their experiences there. The final volume was to have concerned one of the Isaković descendants who returned to the Balkans to fight as a volunteer against the Turks, where he fell at the Battle at Šumatovac in 1876.

Crnjanski remarked that what was finally published as Seobe are "ruine 6 knjiga" ("the ruins of 6 books" 98). Taking up this point, and looking at the time gap between the publication of the two parts of Seobe, Radovan Ždrale claims that Crnjanski began work on the second volume immediately after he had finished the first. But, his original plan for the second novel

changed. He had intended that the main character be Isak Isaković in the years from 1771 to 1800, but in the final version the main character is Pavle Isaković in the years from 1752 to 1760 (99). Considering this proposition, we can see that Crnjanski's treatment of history and time in Seobe and Druga knjiga seoba conflict with his grand design. He does not focus on external events and the historical background to the extent that would lead him to develop a multi-volume work based on highpoints in the history of the Serbs. Crnjanski's presentation of time in both volumes shows time as an inner process, in contrast to a focus on dramatic events which would mark the passage of time as the series of peaks and troughs envisaged by the author in his original plan for the six volumes.

Druga knjiga seoba was offered to the publishing house Minerva by Crnjanski in a letter dated 21 January, 1958, four years before it finally appeared in print (100). Crnjanski continued to claim in interviews that it had never been his intention to publish the two novels together. He said in one interview with Pavle Zorić that the themes of the two novels were different, that the first Seobe concerned the story of a man who is growing old, no longer cares for his wife, and who believes in the search for a utopian future, while Druga knjiga seoba concerns a man who is in love with his dead wife and searches for solace in his vision of

Russia (101). In his interview with Vuletić he was more explicit about how the two came to be published together:

Oba romana štampala je SK Zadruga za svoju (ne moju) 70 godišnjicu. Ona ih je štampala sojuženo. To nije bila moja namera. To sojuženje stvorilo je veze koje su bile i intenzije pisca, ali i takve koje nisu bile intenzije pisca (102).

Both novels were printed by Srpska književna zadruga for its (and not my) seventieth anniversary. It printed them together. That was not my intention. Printing them together created bonds which were the writer's intentions, but others which were not the writer's intentions.

As he pointed out to Vuletić, Druga knjiga seoba was written "pod sasvim drugim okolnostima" ("in completely different circumstances" 103).

Critical opinion on the links between the two novels varies. When Druga knjiga seoba first appeared in Belgrade a round-table discussion was held in the offices of the journal Delo, and afterwards published in its pages. Muharem Pervić considered that the two books were part of the same work:

Seobe i Druga knjiga seoba su jedna knjiga, iz istog senzibiliteta, knjiga početa i završena u našoj duhovnoj i literarnoj klimi prvih decenija dvadesetog veka (104).

Seobe and Druga knjiga seoba are one book, from the same sensibility, a book begun and completed in our spiritual and literary climate of the first decades of the twentieth century.

Borislav Mihajlović countered Pervić by pointing to the

very different sentence structures which characterise the two novels (105). Others have considered the time between the appearances of the two novels as marking the division between two creative periods in Crnjanski's life, while maintaining that the two periods are connected both in terms of Crnjanski's narrative style and the subject matter of the two novels (106). Much of the difference between the two novels has been described in terms of greater lyricism in Seobe, and a greater interest in the historical background and inclusion of an epic flavour in Druga knjiga seoba (107).

Crnjanski draws on his experience as an émigré in London for his last novel, Roman o Londonu. It concerns the plight of an émigré Russian aristocrat, Prince Nikolaj Rodionovič Rjepnin, who is forced to leave Russia shortly after the October revolution. While waiting at Kerch to be evacuated, he catches sight of a young girl, Nada, also waiting on the quayside. She is seventeen, and ten years younger than Rjepnin, but soon to become his wife. He and Nada live in various cities on the continent, and move from Paris to London in 1940 because of the war. The novel tells their story from the beginning of 1947 to late 1948. It is difficult to be sure about the precise chronology of the story. Svetozar Koljević describes the problem of the "temporal cross-references" in the novel (108). Tracing the year of their arrival from comments made by

## CHAPTER ONE

Rjepnin he concludes that they arrived in England in 1941; a date which would match the date of Crnjanski's own arrival in England with his wife. In Koljević's reckoning this means that the "present tense of the novel is set in 1946 and 1947" (109). However, at one point in the novel, while Rjepnin takes his wife to Southampton to get the boat for America, there is mention of the Berlin air-lift. According to this evidence, the novel is set in 1947 and 1948.

On arrival in London, they are wealthy and stay in the Park Lane Hotel, but when the novel opens they are living in a small flat in Mill Hill. Rjepnin has not worked for a year, and Nada keeps them both by selling her splendid gowns and making dolls. Their poverty is made the worse by their isolation. They do not see any friends and have little contact with their neighbours and other inhabitants of London. In this desperate situation Rjepnin feels particularly guilty that his wife is forced to share his poverty, and at the beginning of the novel he considers suicide. Their material problems ease when Rjepnin gets a job as a book-keeper in a shoe shop in central London. They are also helped by an émigré Polish countess, Panova, who finds them better accommodaton, and pays for Rjepnin to take a holiday in Cornwall. The hotel where he stays is one which is often used by Russian and Polish émigrés, amongst whom he makes new friends. However, Rjepnin

does not view these events as an opportunity to improve his life, and his depression only deepens. As if to fulfil his dark view, when he returns from Cornwall he loses his job, and he loses his new friends when he refuses to follow their lead and condemn Stalin. He and Nada plan to go to America to make a new life for themselves. Nada has an aunt there, and she has offered her help. Rjepnin stays behind when his wife leaves, intending to join her later. Left alone in London he plans his suicide with which the novel closes. This novel, like the others but in a different way, questions the effect which memory, history, and myth have on an individual's sense of his own self.

All Crnjanski's novels have certain features in common. The main characters are serving or have served as soldiers: Vuk and Pavle Isaković are officers in the Habsburg army, the diarist in Dnevnik o Černojeviću fought in the First World War, and Rjepnin often recalls his days as an officer in the imperial Russian army. All the characters are affected by historical events which force them to reflect on their lives. The diarist has recently returned from the First World War, in Seoba and Druga knjiga seoba the characters are faced with changes in the European balance of power and Habsburg policy towards the Serbs, and the Russian Revolution forces Rjepnin into emigration. Emigration and exile are central themes in all his novels. He also

draws on personal experience as material for both his first and last novels.

Crnjanski had an uneven literary career. He was feted as the most outstanding representative of the younger generation of modernist poets after the First World War. Later, he was attacked by many former friends because of his political views. His attempt to make a career for himself as a diplomat failed, and he lived for many years abroad. During the fifties his poetry provided significant models for new poets tired of the constrictions of Socialist Realism; in fact, this period is termed Crnjanski's "drugo razdoblje modernizma" ("second period of modernism" 110) by Aleksandar Petrov. When he did return home he was greeted with wide acclaim for his contribution to Serbian literature. In 1966 a collected edition of his works appeared in ten volumes (111), to be followed by another collected edition in fourteen volumes in 1983. His post-war novels rank him alongside such writers as Meša Selimović, Ivo Andrić, and Mihailo Lalić for their depth of psychological insight. Radovan Vučković, indeed, draws a close parallel between Crnjanski's Druga knjiga seoba and Andrić's historical novels and short stories (112). However, it is Crnjanski's contribution to the aesthetics and poetics of Serbian modernism which dominates discussion of his position and status in Serbian literature of the twentieth century.



## CHAPTER ONE

Much of what informed his sumatraist style stayed with him for the whole of his life and is evident in his novels. The relationship between sumatraism and time forms the basis for the next chapter.

Notes

1. Radomir Konstantinović, "Miloš Crnjanski", Biće i jezik, vol 1, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1983, p349.
2. Miloš Crnjanski, Roman o Londonu, Nolit, Belgrade, 1971, (VIII, IX).  
The first reference to each work by Crnjanski will give the original publication, followed by the volume numbers in which the work is to be found in the Izabrana dela, Nolit, Belgrade, 1983. Crnjanski's collected works of 1983 number fourteen volumes, of which volumes VIII and IX contain Roman o Londonu. References will be given to the relevant volume from the 1983 edition of his collected works in Roman numerals, and the page number in Arabic numerals.
3. Miloš Crnjanski, Embahade, Nolit, Belgrade, 1982, (XIII, XIV).  
Miloš Crnjanski, Knjiga o Mikelandelu, Nolit, Belgrade, 1981.
4. Predrag Palavestra, "Doba modernizma u srpskoj književnosti", Književna istorija, 1979, XII, 45, p149.
5. Miloš Crnjanski, Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, Izdanje sveslovenske knjižarnice M. J. Stefanovića, Belgrade, 1921, (II).  
Miloš Crnjanski, Seobe, Knjižara Gece Kona, Belgrade, 1929, (III), (first serialised in Srpski književni glasnik 1927-1929).
6. Nikola Petković, Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 1985, p9.
7. Pavle Zorić, "Struktura poetske proze Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, p209.
8. Miloš Crnjanski, Seobe i Druga knjiga seoba, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1962, (IV, V). Each edition of Druga knjiga seoba has been published along with Seobe.
9. Svetlana Velmar-Janković, "Pesnik trenutka koji nestaje", Miloš Crnjanski, Sabrane pesme, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1978, pvii.
10. Radomir Konstantinović, "Pesnik pred ogledalom. Miloš Crnjanski: Itaka i komentari", Politika, 13

December 1959, p15.

11. Petar Džadžić, Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog, Nolit, Belgrade, 1976.

12. A. A. Mendilow, Time and the Novel, Peter Nevill, London, 1952, p23.

13. Gérard Genette, Narrative Discourse, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1980.

14. Miloš Crnjanski, "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, I, 4, pp265-270, (I, pp207-214).

Miloš Crnjanski, "Za slobodni stih", Misao, 1922, VIII, 4, pp282-287, (XII, pp7-14).

References to these two essays and the quotations taken from them in Chapters One and Two of this thesis are given without further footnotes.

15. Major sources of autobiographical material and memoirs:

Miloš Crnjanski, Pisma iz Pariza I - VII, Nova Evropa, 1921. These and other travelogues have been collected together in volume XI, Putopisi, of the 1983 edition of his collected works.

Miloš Crnjanski, "Posleratna književnost", Letopis Matice srpske, 1929, 320, 2, pp193-205; 320, 3, pp344-359, (XII, pp63-92).

Miloš Crnjanski, Itaka i komentari, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1959, (I).

Miloš Crnjanski, Kod Hyperborejaca, Sabrana dela Miloša Crnjanskog, vols 7 and 8, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1966, (VI, VII).

Miloš Crnjanski, Embahade, (see note 3.).

16. I, p109.

17. Nikola Drenovac, "Miloš Crnjanski", Pisci govore, Grafos, Belgrade, 1964, p52. Compare with I, p113, (Itaka i komentari, 1959, p16).

18. Radovan Popović, Život Miloša Crnjanskog, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1980, p7. Compare with I, p114, (Itaka i komentari, 1959, p17).

19. Miloš Crnjanski, "Sudba", Golub, 1908, XXX, 5, p76, (I, p7).

20. Miloš Crnjanski, "U početku baše sjaj", Bosanska vila, 1912, XXVII, 5, p66, (I, p227).

21. I, p121.

## CHAPTER ONE

22. Crnjanski published fourteen poems in Savremenik during 1917 and 1918, including "Himna", "Groteska", "Naša elegija" etc.
23. Miloš Crnjanski, Lirika Itake, S. B. Cvijanović, Belgrade, 1919, (I).
24. XII, p78.
25. XII, p79.
26. Jovan Deretić, Istorija srpske književnosti, Nolit, Belgrade, 1983, p505.
27. I, p189.
28. Miloš Crnjanski, Maska, Društvo hrvatskih književnika, Zagreb, 1918, (X).  
Miloš Crnjanski, Priče o muškom, S. B. Cvijanović, Belgrade, 1920, (II).  
Miloš Crnjanski, Antologija kineske lirike, Napredak, Belgrade, 1923, (I).  
Miloš Crnjanski, Pesme starog Japana, Napredak, Belgrade, 1928, (I).
29. Miloš Crnjanski, "Sumatra", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, I, 4, p262, (I, p231).  
Miloš Crnjanski, "Stražilovo", Misao, 1921, VII, 2, pp98-100, (I, pp237-244).  
Miloš Crnjanski, "Serbia", Srpski književni glasnik, 1926, XVII, 1, pp21-24, (I, pp253-257).
30. Aleksandar Flaker, "Symbolism or Modernism in Slavic Literatures", Russian Literature, 1979, VII, 4, p334.
31. Denys Val Baker, Little Reviews 1914-1943, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1943.
32. There were just ten issues of Dan from 1 July to 15 November 1919.
33. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, "The Name and Nature of Modernism", Modernism 1890-1930, edited by Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1981, p23.
34. Predrag Palavestra, "Pravci proučavanja međuratne srpske književnosti (1919-1941)", Međuratna srpska književnost, edited by Marko Nedić, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IX, Belgrade, 1983, p16.
35. "Miloš Golubović", XII, p325.

36. Dragiša Vitošević, "Posleratna avangarda i Miloš Crnjanski", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, p13.
37. Aleksandar Flaker, Poetika osporavanja, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1982, p237.
38. I, p122, p132.
39. Branimir Ćosić, "U razgovoru sa g. Milošem Crnjanskim, pesnikom, pripovedačem, itd.", Deset pisaca, deset razgovora, Geca Kon. Belgrade, 1931, p75.
40. Aleksandar Petrov, Poezija Crnjanskog i srpsko pesništvo, Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1971, p155.
41. XII, p82.
42. Bogdan Popović and Slobodan Jovanović, "Čitaocima nove serije Srpskog književnog glasnika", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, I, 1, pp1-4.
43. E. D. Goy, "The Reception of Post-War Modernism in Srpski književni glasnik 1920-1928", Annali dell' Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1967, X, p144.
44. Mirko Žeželj, "Miloš Crnjanski", Srpski književni glasnik, 1939, LVIII, 4, p216.
45. Marko Car, "Podgrejani simbolizam", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, I, 2, p123.
46. Branko Lazarević, "Lirika G. Crnjanskog", Srpski književni glasnik, 1921, II, 7, p530.
47. E. D. Goy, p161.
48. see Aleksandar Flaker, "Symbolism or Modernism in Slavic Literatures", Russian Literature, 1979, VII, 4, pp329-348.
49. XII, p82.
50. XII, p83.
51. XII, p88.
52. Aleksandar Petrov, p237.
53. Ljuba Vukmanović, "Miloš Crnjanski o Branku, o

Fruškoj Gori, o Poeziji", Dnevnik, 31 Decemeber 1967, p13.

54. Edmund Wilson, Axel's Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870-1930, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1959, pp1-2.

55. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, p47.

56. Branimir Ćosić, p87.

57. "Laza Kostić", XII, p49.

58. Predrag Palavestra, "'Pesnički roman Miloša Crnjanskog", Gradina, 1981, XV, 2, p5.

59. Radomir Konstantinović, "Miloš Crnjanski", Biće i jezik, I, Prosveta, Belgrade, p349.

60. Slobodan Z. Marković, "Sumatraizam", Književne pojave između dva svetska rata, Milić Rakić, Valjevo, 1982, p54.

61. Pavle Zorić, "Poezija se ne može pisati bez romantizma", Književne novine, 6 June 1970, p12.

62. Ralph Freedman, The Lyrical Novel: Studies in Herman Hesse, André Gide, and Virginia Woolf, Princeton University Press, 1963, p1.

63. Renato Poggioli, The Theory of the Avant-Garde, Belknap Press, Cambridge Mass., 1981, p217.

64. Miloš Crnjanski, (written under the pseudonym Harald Johnsson), Podzemni klub, Napredak, Pančevo, 1921, (republished in instalments in Politika, 12 February to 12 March 1985, and in a xerox copy by Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Belgrade, 1985).

65. The debate whether it is an original work by Crnjanski or a translation by him can be followed in the following articles:

Mirjana Popović-Radović, "Nepoznati detektivski roman Miloša Crnjanskog", Književne novine, 15 January 1985, p15.

Vićezoslav Hronjec, "Da li je Miloš Crnjanski napisao roman Podzemni klub", Književne novine, 1 November 1986, p18.

Mirjana Popović-Radović, "Jedini verodostojni svedok je pisac", Književne novine, 1 December 1986, p19.

Vićezoslav Hronjec, "Odgovor Mirjani Popović-Radović", Književne novine, 15 January 1987, p2, (published as a letter).

66. Miloš Crnjanski, Suzni krokodil, Srpski književni glasnik, 1931, XXXII, 1, pp26-34; 2, pp107-118; 3, pp189-198; 4, pp265-277.
67. Miloš Crnjanski, Kap španske krvi, Nolit, Belgrade, 1970, (first serialised in Vreme, 15 March to 17 April 1932, 24 to 29 April 1932).
68. Branko Aleksić, "Crnjanski i Maks Ofils takmaci za Lolu Montez", Književna reč, 25 December 1986, p9.
69. Vladimir Bunjac, "Pisci su dobili nov položaj", Književne novine, 16 December 1977, p3.
70. Miloš Crnjanski, Sveti Sava, Zadruga Profesorskog društva, Belgrade, 1934.
71. I. p205.
72. Milan Komnenić, "Razgovor sa Crnjanskim", Delo, 1973 XIX, 10, p1127.
73. Radovan Vučković, Poetika hrvatskog i srpskog ekspresionizma, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1979, p189.
74. Radovan Vučković, p198.
75. Extracts from the daily press concerning the disputes and trials of the period and an analysis of the issues were published by Stanko Tomašić, Beogradske književne afere, Binoza, Zagreb, 1932.
76. Olga Srdanović-Barač, "Službovanje Miloša Crnjanskog u pančevačkoj gimnaziji", Zbornik Matice srpske za književnost i jezik, 1978, XXXVI, 1, pp167-177.
77. Radovan Popović, p182, pp162-166.
78. In his travelogues from Croatia, Crnjanski shows no sign of hostility or animosity towards Croatia, its history, traditions, culture, or people.
79. Milan Bogdanović, "Slom posleratnog modernizma", Književnost između dva rata II, edited by Jovan Hristić, Srpska književnost u književnoj kritici, vol 8, Nolit, Belgrade, 1966, p343, (first published in 1934).
80. Milan Bogdanović, p346.
81. Marko Ristić, "Protiv modernističke književnosti", Književnost između dva rata II, edited by Jovan Hristić, Srpska književnost u književnoj kritici, vol 8, Nolit, Belgrade, 1966, p350, (first published in 1932).

82. XIV. p33.
83. Radovan Zogović, "Književni isljednici, i njihovi advokati", Na poprištu, Kultura, Belgrade, 1947, pp9-12.
84. Marko Ristić, "Tri mrtva pesnika", Rad Jugoslovenske akademije znanosti i umetnosti, 1954, 301, pp245-316.
85. Zoran Mišić, "O smislu i besmislu. O lirici 'mekog i nežnog štimunga', o jednoj čežnji i jednom govoru na svim jezicima sveta", Mladost, 1952, VIII, 2/3, pp113-128.
86. Predrag Palavestra, "Jedan živi pesnik. (Miloš Crnjanski: Itaka i komentari, Prosveta, Beograd, 1959; predgovor T. Mladenović)", Književne novine, 20 November 1959, p3.
87. Nikola Milošević, Roman Miloša Crnjanskog: Problem univerzalnog iskaza, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1970.  
Aleksandar Petrov, Poezija Crnjanskog i srpsko pesništvo, Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1971.  
Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović (eds), Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972.  
Petar Džadžić, Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog, Nolit, Belgrade, 1976.  
Slavko Leovac, Romansijer Miloš Crnjanski, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1981.  
Novica Petković, Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 1985.  
David Norris (ed), Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, Astra press, Nottingham, 1988.  
Stevka Šmitran, Crnjanski i Mikelandelo, Bagdala, Kruševac, 1988.
88. Miloš Crnjanski, Odabrani stihovi, D. R. Aćimović, Paris, 1954.
89. Miloš Crnjanski, Seobe. Dnevnik o Carnojeviću, Minerva, Subotica, 1956.
90. Miloš Crnjanski, Konak, Minerva, Subotica, 1958, (X).
91. Miloš Crnjanski, "Lament nad Beogradom", Književne novine, 7 September 1962, p1.
92. See note 15.



93. Ljubiša Jeremić, "Kod Hyperborejaca - Putopis, uspomene, pamflet, ili roman?", Proza novog stila, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1978, pp46-75.
94. Fragments of the typescript are kept in the archive of the Miloš Crnjanski Foundation, an examination of which quickly reveals that Crnjanski's command of the language was not up to the task of writing a novel in English. For information on Crnjanski and England see Dušan Puvačić, "Crnjanski's Links with England", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp105-124.
95. Radovan Popović, p216.
96. VII, p136.
97. Anđelko Vuletić, "U Londonu sa Milošem Crnjanskim", Delo, 1965, XII, 1, p127.
98. Anđelko Vuletić, p129.
99. Radovan Ždrale, "Crnjanskove Seobe i Piščevićevi Memoari", Letopis Matice srpske, 1972, 409, 4, p406.
100. Uglješa Krstić, "Beleške jednog izdavača", Savremenik, 1981, XXVII, 5, pp350-366.
101. Pavle Zorić, "Poezija se ne može pisati bez romantizma".
102. Anđelko Vuletić, p129.
103. Anđelko Vuletić, p128.
104. Muharem Pervić et al, "Razgovor o romanu Seobe u redakciji časopisa Delo", Delo, 1963, IX, 1, p5.
105. Muharem pervić et al, p7.
106. Velimir Visković, "Seobe i njihovo mjesto u stvaralaštvu Miloša Crnjanskog", Književna istorija, 1973, V, 20, p607.  
Radoje Simić, "Gramatička i intonacijska struktura proznog dela Miloša Crnjanskog", Književna istorija, 1978, XI, 41, p16.
107. Radovan Vučković, "Osnovne crte simbolike i strukture romana Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Književne analize, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Sarajevo, 1972, p122.  
Pavle Zorić, "Struktura poetske proze Miloša Crnjanskog" p226.

Slavko Leovac, pp43-44.

108. Svetozar Koljević, "The Linguistic Aspects of the International Theme in Roman o Londonu", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, p83.

109. Svetozar Koljević, p84.

110. Aleksandar Petrov, p18.

111. Miloš Crnjanski, Sabrana dela Miloša Crnjanskog, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1966.

112. Radovan Vučković, "Osnovne crte simbolike i strukture romana Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", p124.

PART TWO

CHAPTER TWO

SUMATRAISM AND TIME

Crnjanski's personal style has been called sumatraism, both by the author himself and by critics. The term is derived from the title of his poem "Sumatra", which is famous not only in itself but also because of the manifesto essay which accompanied its first appearance "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" in 1920. By studying Crnjanski's two essays, "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" and "Za slobodni stih" written within two years of each other, we can utilise the author's own ideas about language, literary form, and time to inform our own analysis of his novels. Although both essays were written at an early stage in his career, the basic thoughts which we find in them stayed with him throughout his life with certain changes and developments, which will be traced in this study. There are two elements in this chapter. The first is an analysis of Crnjanski's aesthetics and views of literature which are relevant to the examination of time in his novels. The second concerns the ways in which time has been discussed with particular reference to

modernism.

Sumatra is the name of an island in the South Seas and evokes an exoticism which is characteristic of modernism. More specifically, it is a term redolent of Gauguin's many years spent on another South Sea island, Tahiti. However, when considering the origin of the term in Crnjanski's poem we find a literary reference which is more informative than details of an artistic, geographical, or biographical nature. The word "sumatra" echoes part of the phonetics of the first line of a poem written by Sima Pandurović, "Svetkovina": "Sišli smo s uma u sjajan dan" ("We went out of our minds one fine day" 1). Pandurović's poem, published before the First World War, represented the strain of symbolist and intimist lyric poetry much criticized in its day. Pandurović and Petković-Dis were two pre-war poets whose work is important in the development of the first phase of the rebellious new poetry of Serbian modernism. Crnjanski makes a specific reference to Pandurović, and to his influence on his own work in the years immediately after the war, in his 1929 essay "Posleratna književnost":

Pandurović je, tada, za mene bio najistaknutiji pesnik naše "Moderne", i njegove dve pesme iz Antologije znao sam naizust (2)

Then, Pandurović was for me the most prominent poet of our "Moderna", and I knew by heart his two poems from the Anthology.

The Anthology to which Crnjanski refers is the Antologija novije srpske lirike edited by Bogdan Popović (3). Pandurović's poem "Svetkovina" is one of the two included in this anthology. Crnjanski's poem reads:

SUMATRA

Sad smo bezbrižni, laki i nežni.  
Pomislimo: kako su tihi, snežni  
vrhovi Urala.

Rastuži li nas kakav bleđi lik,  
što ga izgubismo jedno veče,  
znamo da, negde, neki potok,  
mesto njega, rumeno teče!

Po jedna ljubav, jutro, u tuđini,  
dušu nam uvija, sve tešnje,  
beskrajnim mirom plavih mora,  
iz kojih crvene zrna korala,  
kao, iz zavičaja, trešnje.

Probudimo se noću i smešimo, drago,  
na Mesec sa zapetim lukom.  
I milujemo daleka brda  
i ledene gore, blago, rukom.

Now we are carefree, light and gentle,  
We think: how quiet, are the snowy  
peaks of the Urals.

Should a pale face sadden us,  
because we lost it one evening,  
we know that, somewhere, a stream,  
in its stead, flows pink!

One love, one morning, in a foreign country,  
envelops our soul, ever tightly,  
in the infinite peace of the blue seas,  
from which shine red beads of coral,  
like cherries, from home.

We wake at night and smile, lovingly,  
at the Moon with its drawn bow.  
And we caress the distant hills  
and the frozen mountains, tenderly, with our hand.

Crnjanski's re-interpretation of Pandurović's first

line attests to his own early work as a link between the pre-war symbolist poets and the post-war expressionists and futurists (4). The previous generation had shown interest in madness and other forms of psychological and emotional disturbance. In Crnjanski's hands the reference is more finely tuned to the irrational and the intuitive as modes of thinking and perceiving. "S uma", meaning "out of mind", only means out of a particular cast of mind. Crnjanski's "s-uma-traism" is an aesthetic system in the artistic text, and outside in life. When "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" first appeared many of his critics pointed to an underlying nihilism in his ideas. While there is a strain of nihilism to be found, particularly in the first of his two essays, with his second essay he clarifies his earlier position. Crnjanski's views are not based on chaos, but on the need to free language and ways in which the world is perceived and experienced from the positivist assumptions of the nineteenth century.

Crnjanski's "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" is written in two parts. The first part is a manifesto of the aesthetic views of his whole generation, answering many of the criticisms of more conservative and traditional writers. The second part is a description of the circumstances which led to his writing the poem. While travelling by train he met an old friend at Zagreb railway station who was returning home from the war.

His friend told him of the camp in the Urals where he had been imprisoned, and of his long journey which had taken him via Japan and England. Interspersed with these memories are his friend's comments on both immediate and future matters. He says that his mother has recently died, and as for the future he expects that he will get a job in a bank. The incongruity of his expectations for the future with his horrific experiences of the world war is striking. This sense of incongruity is compounded by a number of remarks, for example, the author comments that when he met his friend "kraj mene su, tog dana, prolazili Senegalcu" ("some Senegalese walked past me on that day").

Crnjanski continued on his journey. At first, his thoughts, his meeting with his friend, and the activity of the people surrounding him on the train whirl round, leaving the poet to think "gle, nikakvih veza nema u svetu" ("look, there are no points of contact in this world"). The word "veza" ("bond", "link", "association", "contact") is one of the key words in Crnjanski's sumatrazm. The word can be translated in many ways into English, and essentially means a bond in a physical or abstract sense. In this scene the poet is commenting on the lack of coherence between his inner world and the outer world. He feels the disjuncture as a powerful force isolating himself from the events surrounding his life. Gradually, his own thoughts began

to mix with the impressions which the chance meeting with his friend had left, and he writes that "moje misli, jednako su još pratile mog druga na njegovom putovanju" ("my thoughts, they continued to follow my friend on his journey"). He recalls the distant seas and islands which had been mentioned, reflecting:

Najzad, mir, mir zore, polako je ulazio i u mene. Sve što je moj drug pričao, pa i on sam, poguren, u pohabanom, vojničkom šinjelu, ostalo je zauvek u mom mozgu. Odjednom sam se sećao, i ja, gradova, i ljudi, koje sam ja video, na povratku iz rata. Prvi put primetih neku ogromnu promenu u svetu.

At last, the peace, the peace of the dawn, slowly entered me. Everything which my friend had said, and he himself too, stooped, in a shabby army greatcoat, has remained in my mind forever. Suddenly, I too could remember the towns and the people whom I had seen on my return from the war. For the first time I observed a huge change in the world.

And he repeats to himself the words "Sumatra, Sumatra".

The words are an incantation which express the associations which accumulate between himself, his immediate surroundings, and the places which his friend had mentioned. The mingling of different impressions leads him to perceive a change in his relationship with the world. A series of previously unrelated people, incidents, and places have been brought together, and contrary to his earlier feeling that there are no points of contact in the world he remarks:

Pomislilih: kako li će me dočekati moj zavičaj? Trešnje su sad svakako već rumene, a sela su sad vesela. Gle, kako



su boje, čak tamo do zvezda, iste, i u  
trešanja, i u korala! Kako je sve u  
vezi, na svetu. "Sumatra" - rekoh, opet,  
podrugljivo, sebi.

I thought: how will my homeland greet me?  
The cherries are certainly red by now,  
and the villages are merry. Look, how  
the colours, even there by the stars, are  
the same both as the cherries and as the  
coral! How everything is in connection  
in this world. "Sumatra" - I said, again,  
mockingly, to myself.

Crnjanski's description of the circumstances in which he wrote his poem echo much of the poem itself in vocabulary, syntax, and image. What has been said by his friend and the impending sense of his own return home begin to integrate and create a mood which results in an anticipation of the future. Linking his anticipation to the cosmic symbol of the stars, he goes on to say that the dominant sensation which he feels is one of "nemoć" ("powerlessness"). The experience of powerlessness is a loss of the sense of his own being in the immediate present and his surroundings. However, the loss is part of a process in which the poet feels his integration into a wider unity as a quasi-mystical experience. On the one hand, Crnjanski's sumatraist world is one in which all phenomena, including the experiencing subject, form part of a totality. On the other hand, he remarks that he repeats the word "Sumatra" mockingly, as if aware that the totality is itself only the reflection of a fragile mood which cannot endure.

Crnjanski focuses on his loss of fear, which he equates with a loss of contact with his immediate surroundings:

Izgubio sam strah od smrti. Veze za  
okolinu. Kao u nekoj ludoj halucinaciji,  
dizao sam se u te bezmerne, jutarnje  
magle, da ispružim ruku i pomilujem  
daleki Ural, mora indijska, kud je otišla  
rumen i sa mog lica.

I lost my fear of death. Contacts with  
my surroundings. As in a mad  
hallucination, I lifted myself up into  
the immeasurable, morning mists, to put  
out my hand and caress the distant Urals,  
the Indian seas, where the rosy  
complexion fell from my face too.

The poem, and its title, expresses a mood in which spatial and temporal links become insignificant in the poet's contact with a universal flow. Thus, sumatraism comes to represent a view of the world in which all experience and all phenomena exist simultaneously in a bond of association more compelling than the subject's association with the immediate surroundings. In his poem and essay there are many references to geographical features; the Urals, a stream, the sea, coral, homeland, moon, and mountains. These images function in the poem as images of inner feeling amidst the dense texture which they create. By taking as the title of his poem the name of an island in the South Seas, Crnjanski has reinforced the opinion of some critics that his sumatraist views are closely allied to spatial rather than temporal orientation. However, an analysis of his two essays and the origin of the title sheds light on

his outlook, which is in some ways antithetical to spatial orientation.

Some critics have discovered in sumatraism a special emphasis on images of place, which confirms the view that Crnjanski's work is generally dependent on specific use of place imagery. In his book Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog Petar Džadžić takes this view as the basis for his analysis of Crnjanski. Džadžić discusses the function of places in Crnjanski's works which have a "geografski alibi" ("geographical alibi" 5), by which he means not the evocation of place as scene but the names of places taken from the real world and applied with specific meanings in the writer's texts. Džadžić calls such images "spaces of bliss", and he considers them antithetical to the inevitable destruction which time brings:

Prostori sreće ograđeni su zaštitnim omotačem od nasilja i destrukcije vremena, od hoda smrti (6).

The Spaces of Bliss are enclosed by a protective shell from the violence and destruction of time, from the march of death.

Džadžić's analysis throw interesting light on the use of place imagery in Crnjanski's novels. However, in our judgement the origin of Crnjanski's sumatraism is a literary reference to human perception and experience, and is not a spatial or geographic reference. In discussion of the title "Sumatra" Nikola Milošević remarks that "ime Sumatra u ovom slučaju ne treba da

izazove asocijacije istorijsko-geografskog tipa" ("the name Sumatra in this case need not evoke historical or geographical associations" 7). Radovan Vučković regards Crnjanski's use of such imagery as a typical response of his generation in their search for utopia, not as a place but as an ideal:

Ideja sumatraizma, koja se pripisuje Crnjanskom, i bitno je obeležje njegove filozofije i kasnije, tipično je ekspresionistička pojava i zasniva se na sintezi utopijskog kosmizma i vitalističkog univerzalizma. Misao o nekoj dalekoj nepoznatoj zemlji samo je jedna od mnogih utopija koje je tadašnja mlada generacija u svetu, nakon stravičnih iskustava u ratu, donela sa sobom kao neki mogući model rešenja bez rešenja svoje dramatične situacije (8).

The idea of sumatraism, which is ascribed to Crnjanski, and which is a fundamental trait of his philosophy later too, is a typically expressionistic effect and is based on a synthesis of a cosmic utopia and a compelling universality. The thought of a distant unknown land is only one of the many utopias which the then young generation in the world, after the terrible experiences in war, brought with them as a potential model of the solution without solutions for their dramatic situation.

Aleksandar Flaker comes to a similar conclusion in his book Poetika osporavanja (9). Crnjanski's use of such images of place generates universal meanings. It is not the specific place which is significant but the ways in which a series of them are associated beyond the syntagm of the individual lines. The use of images of place expresses psychological and emotional states which are not rational thought processes but irrational and

intuitive. As Milan Bogdanović commented in one of his early defences of post-war modernism "novi pesnici delaju po intuiciji" ("the new poets act according to intuition" 10).

Crnjanski continued to use the word "Sumatra", and from that coined the terms "sumatraist" and "sumatraism". They occur in his first novel Dnevnik o Černojeviću. *A character* proclaims "ja sam sumatraista" ("I am a sumatraist" 11), while the diarist thinks that he may be drunk. The term "Sumatra" is again linked to the *same character*:

Ne, nije više znao šta je dobro, a šta je zlo, niti je znao zašto govore toliko o životu, nije se mešao u prepirke, i nije više verovao ni u šta, do u neke plave obale na Sumatri. Tamo je bila njegova sudbina. Osećao je da je njegov život samo rumene jedne biljke radi na Sumatri (12).

No, he no longer knew what was good, and what was bad, nor did he know why they spoke so much about life, he did not interfere in their squabbles, and he no longer believed in anything, except for the blue shores of Sumatra. There was his fate. He felt that his life was for the sake of just one rosy plant on Sumatra.

*The character* "X" is a seaman, and the reference appears, on the one hand, to be to the distant island in the Indian Ocean. However, the text as a whole is narrated in the dreamy atmosphere of the diarist's memories, following associative lines of thought. Events are narrated out of their temporal sequence, leaving words, incidents, and images to trigger off associations hovering just

below the surface of the diarist's memory. *The sailor* possesses an uncertain psychological status, as an hallucination or inner vision of unrealised potential in the diarist himself. He floats on the edge of a mental and emotional horizon "s uma": out of the rational mind.

Crnjanski continued to use the term sumatraism in his travelogues from the early 20s and later non-fiction writings:

Vi znate da ja imam ludu teoriju "sumatraizma": da život nije vidljiv, i da zavisi od oblaka, rumenih školjaka, i zelenih trava čak na drugome kraju sveta (13).

You know that I have a mad theory of "sumatraism": that life is invisible, and that it depends on the clouds, pink shells, and the green grass even on the other side of the world.

In his use of the phrase he maintains reference to distant places, and he maintains a tone which indicates an ethereal vision of the world. There is another reference in Kod Hyperborejaca when Crnjanski is talking on the telephone to a young Swede:

Mladi Šveđanin se smeje u telefonu. Čuo je, kaže, o toj mojoj teoriji nepoznatih veza u svetu. O tom se priča u našem društvu (14).

The young Swede laughed into the telephone. He has heard, he said, about my theory of unknown connections in the world. It was talked about amongst our friends.

In this book Crnjanski writes about his concern with those associations, and they are frequently connections between past and present times. Crnjanski switches from

the actual time of narration in 1965, to the time of the events in 1940-41, to the time of a trip taken to the far north and Spitzbergen some years earlier. These three times represent respectively the author's private life, his life in the past and the historical events of the time, and the idyllic period of a trip to a place imbued with legend. Interwoven with these three temporal levels are references to the history of Rome, the history of the Slavs, and mythical references. Crnjanski's notion of "veza" is not only to link together events and people from disparate places, but also from disparate times. Far from being a denial of time, sumatraism expresses a complex view of time and its effects on the world.

From an early period critics echoed the author's own use of the terms "sumatra" and "sumatraism", with particular attention to his notion of "veza". In a review of Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću written in 1922 Milan Dedinac writes:

Crnjanski je našao potvrdu svoje umetnosti u snažnom temperamentu ovog vremena i eteričnom lirizmu Sumatre (15).

Crnjanski has found confirmation of his art in the powerful temperament of the age and the ethereal lyricism of Sumatra.

Sumatraism even became a subject for comment itself in Aleksandar Ilić's article "Sumatraizam Miloša Crnjanskog" written in 1924. Ilić concludes that in his Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću Crnjanski is celebrating the

"mistika prošlosti i mistika današnjice" ("mystique of the past and mystique of the present" 16). In 1929 Marko Ristić wrote a long review of Seobe in which he discusses the expression of "veze" in the novel as "te veze, te saglasnosti, u vremenu, i u prostoru" ("those connections, those harmonies, in time, and in space" 17), linking Crnjanski's "veza" with Baudelaire's "correspondances". A period of silence followed as Crnjanski became more embroiled in political debates, broken only by one or two notable exceptions such as Žeželj's article "Miloš Crnjanski" (18), until serious discussion of his work began again in the late 1950s.

In many ways post-war critics echo the terms and preoccupations of the pre-war critics. Dragiša Vitošević, like many others, focuses on Crnjanski's notion of "veza":

Osnovna nit "sumatraizma": "sve je u vezi" provlači se, čak i tako doslovno ispisana, kroz celo delo Crnjanskog: pesme (na primer, "Vetri", "Serenata", "Bolesni pesnik", "Na ulici", "Ljubavnici", "Sumatra", "Stenje", "Bespuće", "Stražilovo" itd.), prozu (Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, Seobe i dr.), putopise ("Pisma iz Pariza", "Piza", "Siena" itd.), sve do raznih članaka (kao što je onaj o Vasi Živkoviću) (19).

The essential thread of "sumatraism": "everything is in association" runs, even when spelt out, through all Crnjanski's work: poems (for example, "Vetri", "Serenata", "Bolesni pesnik", "Na ulici", "Ljubavnici", "Sumatra", "Stenje", "Bespuće", "Stražilovo" etc.), his prose (Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, Seobe and others), travelogues ("Pisma iz Pariza", "Piza", "Siena" etc.), and even various



articles (such as the one concerning Vasa Živković).

Radovan Vučković describes Crnjanski's sumatraist outlook as "filozofija ekspresionizma" ("philosophy of expressionism" 20). Nikola Milošević points to the link between the structure of the poem "Sumatra" and its "filozofska dimenzija" ("philosophical dimension" 21). Zdenko Lešić, on the other hand, emphasises that the message of the poem is to be found "u samom jeziku" ("in the language itself" 22). Mate Lončar has written one of the most comprehensive articles on sumatraism which includes discussion on its historical significance, its philosophical import, and Crnjanski's style of language (23). While sumatraism does not offer a coherent philosophy, it does, however, provide a base on which to build an analysis of time in Crnjanski's novels by its bringing together of ideas and language which "djelotvorno tekla kroza sva kasnija umjetnička ostvarenja Crnjanskog" ("creatively flows through all Crnjanski's later artistic works" 24).

It is only possible to gain a full insight into Crnjanski's ideas on time by complementing his use of "veza" with his use of the term "ritam" ("rhythm"), which is also to be found in his essays, particularly in the second essay "Za slobodni stih". These two terms taken together form the twin principles which characterise Crnjanski's thinking on time and its representation in all his novels. They can also be

related to the debate concerning time in modernism generally. The significance of "veza" in his sumatraist style is clarified when examined along with his views on language and literary forms.

Crnjanski himself expresses the connection between language and ideas in "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'":

Najnovija umetnost, a osobito lirska poezija, pretpostavlja izvesne, nove, osetljivosti. Oni koji ne mogu da dišu izvan, predratne, umetničke atmosfere, prilaze joj uzalud.

Svud se danas oseća da su hiljade i hiljade prošle kraj lešina, ruševina, i obišle svet i vratile se doma, tražeći misli, zakone i život kakvi su bili. Tražeći staru, naviklu, književnost, poznate, udobne, senzacije, protumačene misli. Lirsku poeziju večnih, svakidašnjih metafora, ono drago cile-mile stihova, slikova, hrizantema, koje su cvetale u našim, nedeljnim, dodacima. Ali su došle nove misli, novi zanos, novi zakoni, novi morali! Može se biti protiv nas, ali protiv naših sadržaja, i intenzija, uzalud.

The newest art, and particularly lyric poetry, presupposes certain new sensibilities. They who are unable to breathe outside the pre-war artistic atmosphere approach it in vain.

You get the feeling everywhere you go today that thousands upon thousands have passed by corpses and ruins, toured the world, and returned home searching for the thoughts, laws, and life such as they had been. Searching for the old, accustomed literature, the known, safe, sensations, the second-hand thoughts. Lyrical poetry of eternal, everyday metaphors, that dear old bunch of verses, rhymes, chrysanthemums which blossom in our weekly supplements. But new thoughts, new inspirations, new laws, new morals have arrived! You can be against us, but against what we write and our intentions, in vain.

The "new sensibilities" are recognised by the new forms which have appeared in "post-war culture" (25). Some of those who fought and witnessed the horror of the war desire to return to life as they had left it before hostilities broke out. For Crnjanski, such a life is embodied in the forms of poetry, and in the moulds of thought which had been known before the war. For those like Crnjanski, experience, thought, inspiration, law, morals, and ways of writing have changed forever. Everything pre-war is invalid for the new sensibilities. He focuses on the institutions in which the new sensibilities have made their appearance, and as such he equates ways of writing with law and morality.

However, what is fundamental to Crnjanski's sumatraist outlook is that the changes in language, institutions, and sensibility occur simultaneously. He writes of his generation that "mi sad donosimo nemir, prevrat, u reči, u osećanju, u mišljenju ("we are now bringing anxiety, revolution, in word, in feeling, in thinking"). The anxiety and revolution which they, the modernist generation, express links them to the historical change taking place around them. However, there is a further step for them to take. They have to feel the change taking place, and be able to express it as it happens, to which traditional forms of poetry present a barrier. Crnjanski asserts that, "Bez banalnih četvorokuta i dobošarske muzike dosadašnje

metrike, dajemo čist oblik ekstaze. Neposredno!"

("Without the banal regularity and drumming music of metre before today, we can give the pure form of ecstasy. Directly!"). Immediacy of expression is one of the basic tenets of sumatraism. It is the way for the writer to see beyond the institutions and forms of expression which indicate change, and feel himself to be in the flow of time and experience. The desire for direct contact with experience and reality, and direct expression of it, is the cornerstone on which the Serbian modernists founded their belief in intuitive and irrational thought processes. As Crnjanski remarks in "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'":

Da damo tačnu sliku misli, što  
spiritualnije! Da upotrebimo sve boje,  
lelujave boje, naših snova i slutnji,  
zvuk i šaputanje stvari, dosad prezrenih  
i mrtvih.

Let us give a precise picture of thought,  
as spiritually as possible! Let us use  
all the colours, the floating colours, of  
our dreams and intuitions, the sound and  
whispering of things, which have been  
scorned and dead until now.

Crnjanski and his fellow-modernists in Serbia were not alone in their desire for immediacy of experience and expression. It was a feature of modernism generally, and can be seen in Ezra Pound's description of the poetic image as

that which presents an intellectual and  
emotional complex in an instant of  
time... It is the presentation of such a  
"complex" instantaneously which gives  
that sense of sudden liberation (26).

Pound's emphasis on language and liberation is echoed by Crnjanski, "Oslobodili smo jezik banalnih okova i slušamo ga kako nam on sam, slobodan, otkriva svoje tajne" ("We have liberated language from its banal fetters and we listen to it itself, free, revealing its secrets"). The search for immediacy of experience and expression sought by Crnjanski was a typical feature of the poetry of Pound and Eliot, and of many others in Europe and North America at the time:

Pound and Eliot, like the philosophers, assume that instrumental conventions displace us from immediate experience. Pound incessantly attacks our propensity to substitute conceptual abstractions for concrete sensations, and makes the precise rendering of immediate experience a cornerstone of his poetic programme. Eliot also claims that poetry restores us to "the deeper, unnamed feelings which form the substratum of our being". And New Critics such as Ransom and Tate argue that poetry leads us from the abstract discourse of everyday life to the essential reality that is revealed in immediate experience (27).

Like Crnjanski, they claim that poetry can convey the immediacy of experience, but here the barrier to immediacy is described as "instrumental conventions". Crnjanski claims that time, the convention which divides experience into categories of past, present and future, can be overcome, and that essential truths can cross the centuries, when he states that there exists a "dublji kosmički, zakon i smisao, radi kojeg se tuga, iz Kamoenjšovih soneta, kroz tolika stoleća, prenosi u nas"

("deeper, cosmic, law and meaning, because of which the grief in the sonnets of Camoens is conveyed to us").

This aspect of sumatraism, which does not respect time as a category which displaces the individual from the immediacy of experience, has prompted such remarks of Konstantinović's that Crnjanski conceives of a "vreme s one strane istorije" ("time from the other side of history" 28). However, Crnjanski's views of history, time, values, the individual, and language are all part of the same complex issue intended to lead to a truth and reality closed to those who reject the new sensibilities.

"Veza", one of the basic principles of Crnjanski's sumatraism, is a notion with temporal significance, characterised by the search for the fullness and totality of experience sensed in the moment. It is a reiteration of the unity of subject and world felt instantaneously, as Crnjanski remarks in one of his travelogues, "Sve je u vezi i sve se sliva. Sve se sliva u beskrajni vidik i mir" ("Everything is in association and everything flows together. Everything flows together into an endless horizon and peace" 29). "Veza" echoes Romanticism's illuminatory moment, with its mystical overtones, and the associationism of Baudelaire's "correspondances", with its emphasis on the indivisibility of the symbol and its meaning. However, "veza" has psychological and metaphysical significance

which also links the individual to history and values. It is a principle of simultaneity, a feature of futurist and imagist aesthetics, in which the perceiving subject and the object of experience co-exist. Direct expression of the immediacy of experience cuts across the temporal divisions of past, present, and future, and the division between the individual as an isolated being and the social life of which he is a product in history. For this reason, the term "veza" is referred to as the principle of simultaneity in this study.

In Crnjanski's novels the principle of simultaneity functions on many levels. On the narrative level there is the need to express events which are simultaneous, but have to be strung out in sequence in the text. The expression of such simultaneous events has been described as "round time" by Struk (30). Crnjanski, like other modernist prose writers, disrupts the norms of syntax in order to disturb sequential and causal relations and to question "the continuity of time-, space-, cause- and effect-relations" (31). He links the use of language to Bergson's ideas on psychological time in "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'":

Zvuk naših reči nerazumljiv je, jer se navikao na menjački, novinarski, zvanični smisao reči. Davno je Bergson odelio psihološko vreme od fizičkog. Zato je naša metrika lična, spiritualna, maglovita, kao melodija. Pokušavamo da nađemo ritam svakog raspoloženja, u duhu našeg jezika, čiji je izraz na stupnju feljtonskih mogućnosti.

The sound of our words is incomprehensible, for it has become used to the *exchange*, journalistic, official meaning of words. Long ago Bergson separated psychological time from physical. So our metrics are personal, spiritual, misty, like a melody. We are trying to find the rhythm of each mood, in the spirit of our language, whose expressive potential is no more than that of journalism.

Crnjanski is here countering his critics who complain about the incomprehensibility of language in the work of the young modernist generation. He counters by pointing to the way in which words have lost their plasticity by having imposed on them a rigidity which is advantageous in the writing of newspaper articles, but is a disadvantage in any form of writing which requires nuance and subtlety. His use of the word "menjački" in this context is a disparaging reference to the money markets, and the way in which literature is a market commodity. He links language with mood, and both of these to psychological time as described by Bergson.

The influence of Bergson was felt widely at the time, and spread throughout Europe. In all there are three references to Bergson in Crnjanski's writing: in the essay quoted above; in Kod Hyperborejaca quoted in Chapter One; and in the novel Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću (32). It is not necessary to examine the whole of Bergson's philosophy, but his research on time as a psychological phenomenon, which Crnjanski mentions specifically, is significant for our study. For



## CHAPTER TWO

Bergson, as for Crnjanski, each moment is a unique experience of thoughts, memories, and perceptions, which will never be repeated again. Even when the same object is the object of contemplation, the object is altered by our consciousness because we have a memory of it. The dynamic quality of consciousness in time is termed real duration by Bergson. The moment for Crnjanski is defined by the integration of perceptions, emotions, and memories in a single state of consciousness. The apprehension of that moment, and its expression is the path to a sense of being in the eternal present, with no comprehension of past and future. It is an expression of a universal empathy, when the subject feels at peace with the world, and feels at one with it. There is a direct and intuitive bond between self and world realised in the moment. The moment is of unspecified duration, but is characterised by a dominant mood and feeling which give its homogeneity.

Crnjanski's notion of simultaneity is at odds with definitions of time which rely on empirical evidence, and with rationalist explanations of time. In the rationalist view of time, all events whether psychological, the vaguest flicker of emotion, or actions performed in the physical sense, have an order in which they occur, and have an extension in duration. The progression from one to another indicates the ends and beginnings of actions, separating them into units.

thus providing units which can be isolated and measured. To recognise the point of succession is to impose on the chaos of sensations, impressions, and actions in life an order, which allows for the categorisation of experience, the distilling of experience, and the utilisation of experience in memory. However, with hindsight the significance of experience undergoes transformation itself. The open-endedness and indeterminacy of the moment is its instability. Crnjanski's sumatraist time keeps time as a system of order and coherent structure fluid. The ways of using time to order experience change in the course of time itself.

In Crnjanski's understanding of time the succession and duration of actions are less significant than the intensity of the moment. In this moment Crnjanski and his generation hoped to find the "rhythm of each mood". The experience and expression of the mood reveals for Crnjanski the only essence of being available to the subject. The principle of simultaneity in sumatraism is the moment in which the subject becomes "jednak svojoj vlastitoj suštini" ("equal to his own essence" 33). It opens the way to a particular knowledge of being and the world in the very "dodir između stvari i suštine" ("contact between object and essence" 34). It represents the aspect of sumatraism which is the utopian desire for intuitive knowledge of the self, apprehended

in the "rhythm of each mood".

The focus on the moment in the modernist view of time has led many critics to assert the rejection of time in modernism and its emphasis on spatial concerns. The lack of critical discussion on time in Crnjanski's works supports this view. Lunn remarks on time in modernism generally:

In much modernist art, narrative or temporal structure is weakened, or even disappears, in favour of an aesthetic ordering based on synchronicity, the logic of metaphor, or what is sometimes referred to as "spatial form" (35).

Spatial form was the subject for analysis in Frank's essay "Spatial Form in Modern Literature", where he writes:

For modern literature, as exemplified by such writers as T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, Marcel Proust, and James Joyce, is moving in the direction of spatial form... All these writers ideally intend the reader to apprehend their work spatially, in a moment of time, rather than as a sequence (36).

In Crnjanski's understanding, the moment does have a duration, but it is not a duration which can be measured by the conventions of time. The moment is measured by its intensity and its homogeneity by the experiencing subject. Furthermore, spatial form, like temporal form, is only a pseudo-form in literature since it is the representation of a fictional or imagined world which is at the centre of a work of literature. In some senses there is a spatial form of the book itself, and the

## CHAPTER TWO

writing on the pages, and the reading of the text has a temporal duration, but these are not the objects of literary analysis.

The debate over the difference between spatial and temporal orientation represents two different ways of thinking about experience and its perception, as described by Engelberg:

Space permits subject-object separation, interplay between mind and perceived reality; Time appropriates object into subject and makes reality a product of what Bergson called the "creative evolution" of the mind (37).

In his sumatraism Crnjanski comes closest to describing a view of time as the unity of subject and reality.

This view denies that time is:

The medium in which people grow, individually and collectively: hopes and ambitions come to fruition or are dismayed. Events mark the critical point of change. Individual development is regarded as of general human importance, and considered logical in form: laws of psychological cause and effect, of interaction between character and circumstantial environment, are in operation (38).

This is a description of social time, which is open to the logic of rational investigation; in other words, when subject and object are separated. Time is seen only as the passing of events, each one marking a stage in the development of some larger design. The specific can be measured against the general and evaluated by reference to it. Time is here linked to values, but they are the values gained from careful evaluation of

cause and effect, very different from Crnjanski's sumatraist views. The logic of chronology as ever-extending linear expansion formed by sequences of cause and effect is questioned and subverted by him. Time is regarded as an experience which has an unstable and shifting form measured only by the intensity of the moment.

The emphasis on simultaneity as the model of significant time in Crnjanski's work corresponds to the general interest in contemporary Bergsonian theories of psychological time and the moment. There have been other ways of conceiving of and describing the experience of time in modernism. In Crnjanski's sumatraist outlook the principle of rhythm comes closest to the view of time as return or recurrence. D. H. Lawrence described the cyclic time of primitive tribes in Apocalypse and adds that "our idea of time as a continuity in an eternal straight line has crippled our consciousness cruelly" (39). Lawrence's preference for cyclic time has been reinforced by critics who have recognised a more general preference for such temporal models in modernism, such as Lunn:

Cyclical or mythical recurrence is frequently viewed as a deeper reality than the surfaces disclosed in temporally unfolding historical events, the frame of reference which is so prominent in the literature of nineteenth-century realism (40).

Josipovici noted the preference for a model of time

which he described as a spiral:

I am not suggesting, however, that the way of the spiral, the way of turn and return, is necessarily an advance on the way of fragmentation. Both modes, (is mode the right word? But what is the right word?) are responses to the deep dissatisfaction felt with linear forms by modern writers, painters and composers (41).

The "way of turn and return" which he highlights as part of the spiral is also a cyclic view of time, which he counters to the fragmentation of isolated moments.

Lawrence, Lunn, and Josipovici have commented on models of time which are cyclic. However, they each differ in their precise rendering of the model's significance.

Lawrence's reference to the cycle of time as a primitive model is evidence of a different concern from Lunn's literary reference. Josipovici suggests a more complex view of the cycles of time in his "way of turn and return".

Rhythm is a word which occurs in both Crnjanski's early essays, but has received far less critical attention. It disappears from his later writings, but if due consideration is not given to its meaning and its continuation in his later works, then the significance of simultaneity becomes distorted. The principle of simultaneity loses the harmony of the moment, as each moment becomes isolated and fragmented. The principle of rhythm is the dynamic force which links together moments, not in a progressive and historical

temporality, but by stressing the moment of change from one moment to the next. When speaking of rhythm Crnjanski refers to mood and psychological state, as when he refers to simultaneity. In "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" he comments that he is in search of "ritam svakog raspoloženja" ("the rhythm of each mood"). However, it is in his essay "Za slobodni stih" in which he focuses on rhythm and its meanings and implications both for the literary text and for time:

Samo je neobaveštenost i neznanje krivo što se slobodni stih smatra prozom. Nije ritam ono što čini pesmu pesmom i nije ritam samo dobovanje dvanaesterca. Precenjivanje forme, koje je tako često od Renesansa naovamo, škodilo je najviše razvitku novih forama. A to je šteta. Prošlost lirike je: improvizacija. Najviši stepen njen je kitajska ili japanska lirika, gde se u jednom cvetu, ili u tragu po snegu draganovih stopa, oseti večnost kao u treperenju malih zvezda.

Only uninformed and ignorant opinion is to blame for considering free verse prose. Rhythm is not that which makes a poem and rhythm is not just the beat of the twelve-syllable line. The overemphasis on form, which has been so frequent from the Renaissance to today, has done most damage to the evolution of new forms. And that is a shame. The past of the lyric is: improvisation. Its greatest degree is the Chinese or Japanese lyric, where in a single flower, or in the dragon's footsteps across the snow, eternity is felt as in the twinkling of little stars.

As with his principle of simultaneity, Crnjanski associates rhythm with literary form, and with more than literary form which is always linked to life itself. In

the above quotation he emphasises two features of the lyric: "improvisation" and "eternity". They are labels which indicate temporal relations. Improvisation is the attempt to posit something new. Although the novelty of the result may well be conceived of in an historical framework with our memory of previous models and patterns, it represents a potential origin. Eternity has no beginning nor end available to conception and mind. Rhythm mediates between these two poles. Eternity is a goal which cannot be attained, but its relationship to the potential origin offered in each new moment gives a sense of stability within continual change. Crnjanski's view of cyclic time is one which is regenerative, in that the beginnings and ends of cycles are not returns to the same point, but returns to the search for origin and resolution. As such they are returns to the search for a form of salvation.

In many ways the principle of rhythm is complementary to the principle of simultaneity. He links rhythm to thought, feeling, and word:

Ritam je u misli i u osećaju. On je kao ljubavni šapat kad svaka reč ima svoj dah, svoju boju, svoje trajanje.

Rhythm is in thought and in feeling. It is like a lover's whisper when each word has its own breath, its own colour, its own duration.

And, as with simultaneity, rhythm isolates a sense of the individual's essential being in what Crnjanski terms the "soul";



Moderna umetnička lirika se čita. Ona je sublimno uživanje i slobodni stih, sa svojim ritmom polusna, sasvim vezanim za ritam misli, kod svakog novog raspoloženja nov, fluidan, bez dobovanja okovanog ritma, vrhunac je izraza. On odbacuje sve i ostavlja dušu samu.

The modern artistic lyric is to be read. It is a sublime pleasure and free verse, with its rhythm of half-dream, is absolutely linked to the rhythm of thought, with each new mood comes a new, fluid peak of expression, without the drumbeat of a fettered rhythm. It rejects everything and the soul is left to itself.

However, rhythm differs from simultaneity in that the latter focuses on the homogeneity of the moment as the time in which the essence of being is manifested, while rhythm occurs and recurs between origin and resolution. Simultaneity expresses a sense of harmony and wholeness, but rhythm focuses on the point of transformation from one moment to another:

Slobodni ritam je pravi, lirski ritam neposredan, vezan za raspoloženje. On je seizmografski tačan ritam duševnih potresa. U lirici je ta neposrednost najdragocenija. Reči i izrazi dobili su novu boju.

Free rhythm is the true, lyrical rhythm immediate, linked to mood. It is the seismographically precise rhythm of spiritual quakes. In the lyric that immediacy is most dear. Words and expressions receive new colour.

However, the immediacy of rhythm differs from that of simultaneity. It is not the cosmic harmony in which everything flows together, but is linked to quakes and changes, it is a vital process. The immediacy of rhythm

is felt in the link between the ideal origin and resolution. Vučković, describes it as "ritam disanja i pulsiranja, a ne shema" ("the rhythm of breathing and pulsating, and not a design" 42). Rhythm has no pattern by which to measure the progression of change, but like simultaneity is an inner experience. The changes which occur in an individual's life cannot be defined in advance, and Crnjanski repeats in his commentaries and in his novel Druge knjige seoba that what happens in life occurs according to "slučaj" ("chance" 43). Crnjanski's principle of rhythm indicates an apprehension of the "quakes" as they occur. It is not the experience of the moment itself, but what Kermode terms kairos as "a point in time filled with significance, charged with a meaning derived from its relation to its end" (44).

By combining the principles of simultaneity and rhythm from Crnjanski's two early essays we can see how they reflect each other, and how they clarify each other. He privileges simultaneity as an experience of the moment, at the same time as he announces the dramatic change taking place in sensibility. However, his view of simultaneity does not allow for change. On the other hand, change and diversity is celebrated in rhythm both in terms of form and what the rhythm of free verse can express, when Crnjanski remarks in his essay "Za slobodni stih" that "žalost i radost primamo u istom ritmu" ("we accept sadness and happiness in the same

rhythm"). Later in the same essay, he writes:

Ritam doživljava duboku obnovu. To znaju oni koji su pratili borbu Debussy-jevu. On ostavlja fonetičan fizički red i prelazi u psihički zakon. Svaki sadržaj ima svoj ritam.

Rhythm is undergoing a profound revival. This is known by those who have followed Debussy's struggle. He abandoned a phonetic, physical order and crossed over into psychic law. Every content has its own rhythm.

As every content has its own rhythm, the effect of these twin principles produces an historically more vital view of time and history. It reinstates another form of historical thinking, which Lunn regards as lost in modernism's understanding of time and temporal processes (45). Crnjanski's view does not deny relationships of succession and duration in time, but it does deny any progressive or mechanistic approach. The history of the social world and the self are constantly developing, and interacting. Simultaneity and rhythm, taken together, offer a link between the experiences of intransience and transience. Spender considers this search for the essence of self amidst the fragmentation of change to be a search for wholeness characteristic of modernism's "confrontation of the past with present" (46).

Crnjanski's own essays of the 1920s reveal a similar development in his response to the war, the rejection of former values, and his later attitudes towards Romanticism. Time is a system for the organisation of experience, but it is not an a priori model. Time is

itself under constant creation, modulated by the twin principles of simultaneity and rhythm. Simultaneity and rhythm are principles which have transcendental, psychological, ontological, and historical significance, but they are not reducible to any one of these categories.

Crnjanski's views on time are typical of the modernist understanding of time, but more importantly they are also aspects of his sumatraist style. Since the origin of sumatraism itself is a literary reference, and since he advocated a close link between language and the content of experience, we must examine his use of language in relation to time. Language is not only vocabulary and syntax, but also literary form and style. It is the broader context of the materials at a novelist's disposal. As a novelist Crnjanski orders his material in ways which reflects the principle of simultaneity and the rhythm of a form of cyclic time. In his novels much of what happens is filtered through the consciousness of characters, or related directly by narrators. It is, therefore, only possible to give a full account of his use of language and narrative structures in relation to the different narrating voices. In part, it is through the multiplicity of different voices that his material achieves its temporal complexity.

Notes

1. Sima Pandurović, "Svetkovina", Posmrtna počasti, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1968, pp35-36.
2. XII, p79.
3. Bogdan Popović, Antologija novije srpske lirike, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1911.
4. see Dejvid Noris, "Od Pandurovića do Crnjanskog", Srpski simbolizam: Tipološka proučavanja, edited by Predrag Palavestra, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Naučni skupovi, XXII, Belgrade, 1985, pp339-359.
5. Petar Džadžić, Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog, Nolit, Belgrade, 1976, p23.
6. Petar Džadžić, p18.
7. Nikola Milošević, "Filozofska dimenzija književnih dela Miloša Crnjanskog", Miloš Crnjanski, Sabrana dela Miloša Crnjanskog, vol 1, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1966, p22.
8. Radovan Vučković, Poetika hrvatskog i srpskog ekspresionizma, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1979, p194.
9. Aleksandar Flaker, Poetika osporavanja, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1982, p99.
10. Milan Bogdanović, "Nova poezija", Srpski književni glasnik, 1921, IV, 1, p57.
11. II, p54.
12. II, p62.
13. Pisma iz Pariza, XI, p19.
14. VII, p38.
15. Milan Dedinac, "Dnevnik o Černojeviću od Miloša Crnjanskog", Putevi, 1922, 1, p29.
16. Aleksandar Ilić, "Sumatraizam Miloša Crnjanskog", Raskršenica, 1924, 2, p51.
17. Marko Ristić, "Seobe", Književna politika, Rad, Belgrade, 1979, p96, (first published in 1929)
18. Mirko Žeželj, "Miloš Crnjanski", Srpski književni glasnik, 1939, LVIII, 4, pp208-217; 5, pp278-286.

19. Dragiša Vitošević, "Miloš Crnjanski i posleratna avangarda", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, p29.
20. Radovan Vučković, p194.
21. Nikola Milošević, p24.
22. Zdenko Lešić, "Miloš Crnjanski", Klasici avangarde, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1986, p206.
23. Mate Lončar, "Obzori sumatraizma", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp93-118.
24. Mate Lončar, p94.
25. Predrag Palavestra, "Miloš Crnjanski and the Serbian Avantgarde", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, p4.
26. quoted in Winifred Nowotny, The Language Poets Use, Athlone Press, London, 1962, p57.
27. Sanford Schwarz, The Matrix of Modernism, Princeton University Press, 1985, p6.
28. Radomir Konstantinović, "Pesnik pred ogledalom. Miloš Crnjanski: Itaka i komentari", Politika, 13 December 1959, p15.
29. Pisma iz Pariza, XI, p38.
30. Danylo H. Struk, "Andievska's Concept of Round Time", Canadian Slavonic Papers, 1985, XXVII, 1, pp65-73.
31. Robert W. Weber, "On Modernist Syntax", Essays in Poetics, 1988, 13, 1, p57.
32. II, p46.
33. Radovan Vučković, p194.
34. Radovan Vučković, p194.
35. Eugene Lunn, Marxism and Modernism, Verso, London, 1985, p35.

36. Joseph Frank, "Spatial Form in Modern Literature", The Widening Gyre, Indiana University Press, 1963, pp8-9.
37. Edward Engelberg, "Space, Time, and History: Towards the Discrimination of Modernisms", Modernist Studies, 1974, I, 1, p10.
38. Michael Hollington, "Svevo, Joyce and Modernist Time", Modernism, edited by Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1981, p431.
39. D. H. Lawrence, Apocalypse, Martin Secker, London, 1932, pp97-98.
40. Eugene Lunn, p35.
41. Gabriel Josipovici, "Linearity and Fragmentation", The Lessons of Modernism and Other Essays, Macmillan, London, 1977, p136.
42. Radovan Vučković, p196.
43. I, p145, p153; V, p464.
44. Frank Kermode, The Sense of an Ending, Oxford University Press, 1968, p47.
45. Eugene Lunn, p36.
46. Stephen Spender, The Struggle of the Modern, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1963, p80.

CHAPTER THREE

THE EARLY NOVELS:

TIME, LANGUAGE AND NARRATIVE STRUCTURE

Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću

From the appearance of Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću Crnjanski's use of language aroused controversy. Some, who had little sympathy for the aesthetics and aims of the post-war modernists, considered his style confused. Others recognised in his style something unique which linked modern Serbian literature to contemporary European trends. Svetovski commented on Crnjanski's first novel:

Ovo je lirika sama. Sentimentalna muzika puna podsećanja; nešto što naliči na onu Debisijevu simfoniju što počinje sa le matin d'un jour de fete (1).

It is a lyric itself. Sentimental music full of reminiscence; something which resembles the symphony by Debussy which begins with le matin d'un jour de fete.

Another critic wrote:

Svojim ličnim tonom, koji odaje više pesnika no romansijera, ova velika priča bez događaja potseća mnogo puta na osetljivog, kapriznog Hamsuna (2).

By its lyrical tone, which betrays more a poet than a novelist, this great story without any events reminds one many times of the sensitive, capricious Hamsun.



Crnjanski's lyricism was his originality, a byword for innovation and excitement in literature. His other prose works of this period are written with the same eye to experimentation in prose style and exotic themes (3).

It was also recognised that Crnjanski's novel introduced a new type of narrative structure in which the events of the novel are organised in a different way from previous practice:

Događaji se - a to su uvek samo unutarnji doživljaji glavnog lica - ređaju preko reda, upliću se jedan u drugi bez veze, kao po nekoj čudnoj asocijaciji, slivaju se naglo i preko jedan u drugi kao slike bolesnog sna kao oblici oblaka koje goni vetar (4).

The events - and they are always only the internal experiences of the main character - are arranged contrary to their order, are woven into one another without a connection, as if by some strange association, they flow suddenly one into the other, like pictures in a morbid dream, like the shapes of clouds chased by the wind.

The choice of the critic's words, "veza", "slivaju se", echo Crnjanski's own vocabulary from his essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'". A more recent critic has taken a similar view on the structure of the novel, but expressed herself differently:

Struktura Dnevnika je građena na principima sasvim različitim od principa na kojim se gradi struktura klasičnog romana - nema hronološkog izlaganja događaja sa jasno ocertanom fabulom koja ima svoj jedinstven tok, već se ostvaruje poetsko pripovedanja u kome se prepliću različite vremenske ravni, različiti

tokovi zbivanja i sećanja, različiti  
nivoi asocijativnog itd (5).

The structure of Dnevnik is built on principles completely different from the principles on which the structure of the classical novel is built - there is no chronological exposition of events with a clearly drawn plot which has its unitary flow, rather a poetic narration is created in which are interwoven different temporal planes, different currents of action and memory, different levels of association etc.

Critical opinion on Crnjanski's first novel has remained consistent in its emphasis on the author's use of language, and narrative structure.

The diary is written by a soldier who returns home from the First World War. He has dim memories of his father, who died while he was still a child, and more recent memories of his mother and wider family circle. He outlines certain events which punctuate his growing up, such as his first love affair, and his days as a student in Vienna, which are interrupted by the outbreak of war when he is conscripted into the armies of the Habsburg Empire. During the hostilities he contracts tuberculosis and is sent to a hospital away from the front line. His illness throws him into alternating bouts of feverish anguish and relatively calm moments when he feels mentally composed. While in hospital he has an affair with one of the Polish nurses, which finishes on his discharge. When able to travel, he is sent home, where he finds his mother dying. She dies shortly after his arrival, whereupon people around him

persuade him of the need to find a wife. He marries a local girl, Maca, but their relationship turns sour and they are living apart at the time of writing. He also makes numerous references to Serban history, particularly the Battle of Kosovo and Tsar Dušan.

However, he writes with no regard for chronological sequence and in the diary he makes frequent leaps in time to his childhood, back to the war, to the present, and includes another character, ~~the sailor~~. The diary opens amidst the chaos of war, and then moves back in time to describe memories of his childhood. The diarist returns to his time in the war again, only to jump forward in time to his arrival home, the death of his mother and unsuccessful marriage to Maca. Following these unhappy memories, he writes about the war once more and includes his stay in hospital and his affair with the Polish nurse. From then his memory avoids the war years, and he delivers a long embedded narrative about his dream of his friend the sailor. Following this, the diarist recounts memories of his first sexual experience while on holiday one spring before the war. He then writes about his journey home from the war before finally jumping forward to the present and the time of writing his memories.

The chaotic presentation of his memories heightens the impression he gives of his feverish state while in hospital and implies that even now his consciousness is

disturbed. It is expected that in a diary events are presented in a linear progression, but in this diary the events do not develop progressively. The action of the diary is not the central interest of the diarist. The episodes which he relates provide the context for the diary's confessional tone as the diarist attempts to come to terms with his present existence. The second unusual factor of this diary is in the title which announces that it is "about" someone, rather than "of" someone. The impression of the diarist's disturbed consciousness is reinforced by the episode involving *the sailor* since it is introduced and concluded as if the events of a dream during his stay in hospital.

At the beginning of the novel there is one reference to indicate when the diary is written:

I volim svoj život čarju, koju sam osetio lane, kad sam se vraćao iz onih blatnih, mladih, poljačkih šuma, gde su onoliki ostali poderani i krvavi, sa razlupanim čelom. I pun uspomena, ja ih pišem ponosno, kao Kazanova za one, koji su goreli u požaru života, i koji su sasvim razočarani (6).

And I love my life with the enchantment which I felt last year, when I was returning from the muddy, young, Polish forests, where so many have remained ragged and bloody, with broken heads. And full of memories, I am writing them proudly, like Casanova for those who burnt in the fire of life, and who are completely disillusioned.

The diarist is writing his memories for those who were destroyed by the war. There are those who died on the battlefield, and those, like himself, who have come home

to find themselves alienated from friends and family who have not shared the experience of the war. The diarist writes, "Vojnik sam, o, niko ne zna, šta to znači" ("I am a soldier, oh, no-one knows what that means" 7).

Other than the reference to "last year" on the first page, there is no other indication of when the diary was written. Since his return home his mother has died, and he has married and separated from Maca.

There is nothing to say if the diary was written with long intervals of time between the separate entries, or over what period of time it was written. It is not divided into dated entries, but into a series of episodes taken from memory. The episodes are divided in the text by blank lines. Sometimes the blank lines indicate a change in subject and a jump in time, for example the jump from childhood to war (8), from his unhappy marriage to his stay in hospital and relationship with the nurse (9). Sometimes the jump in time is from a memory to his preoccupation with writing his diary, for example one episode concerning the war is followed by another which opens "Kome ja ovo pišem?" ("Who am I writing this for?" 10). At other times, the blank lines indicate that the following episode is a progression from what has just been related. There is a group of episodes which refer to the diarist's memory of his first love, framed at beginning and end by the words "U primorju je sad proleće" ("On the coast it is now

spring" 11). In those pages the diarist charts the progress of his memory, recounting in separate entries different incidents within the larger event. When separate entries form part of a larger event they are sometimes marked by changes in the tone of narration. For example, returning home from the war the diarist describes his feelings as he arrives, and the episode is dominated by verbs in the first person: "u zoru sam stizao" ("I<sup>would</sup> arrive at dawn"); "ja vidim" ("I can see"); "ja ućutim" ("I fall silent"). The following entry focuses on the reactions of his family: "Dočekuju me i plaču. Mati mi umire. Odvode me u kuću nepoznatu. Ne daju majci. Tetke me grle i plaču" ("They greet me and weep. My mother is dying. They take me off to a strange house. They don't let me see my mother. My aunts embrace me and weep" 12).

The omission of dates and the frequent changes from one memory to another contribute to what Miodrag Petrović describes as "vremenska neodređenost" ("temporal imprecision" 13), in which time appears to provide no order for events in the diary. Petrović is somewhat critical of this feature of Crnjanski's novel. However, although the unity of events does not rely on their succession and duration in time, they do not appear randomly. The diarist assembles his own temporal scheme. The succession of memories is based on the associations which they hold for him in the moment of

writing, and their duration is measured by the emotional intensity which he feels. His return to the moment of writing reveals the duality of time in his diary between the time of writing, and the time of the event recalled, between now and not-now. His attempts to come to terms with certain issues become avenues of escape from the reality of the present. Thus, the succession and duration of events in the diary reflect the diarist's inner desires.

The temporal duality of the diary is founded on the distinction between the time of writing and the time of the events as recounted from his memory. The style in which the work is written is one in which action is minimised and the presence of the diarist is maximised. The characteristic feature of Crnjanski's sentence structure in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću is his fragmentation and disruption of syntactic norms. There are five types of disruption which Crnjanski brings to his text: short sentences with few causal connectives; paratactic constructions; sentences in which the normal hierarchy of elements is disrupted; repetitions; and the omission of main verbs. Although such disruptions of the norm are not in themselves errors, it is their frequency and cumulative effect which reinforce the impression of temporal diffusion. Short sentences do not transgress the norms of syntax, but they produce a staccato effect. More significantly, in this text,

Crnjanski tends to make a series of short statements in which their causal or sequential succession is uncertain:

Radulović mi je doneo dvopeka. Dirali smo neke prljave žene i kupovali smo čokolade. Iz Zlogova smo doneli pune torbe jela. Na trgu je bilo nekoliko obešenih Rusina. Na glavnom putu smo dobili tri teške granate. Bilo je već dosta mrtvih. Navikli smo se (14).

Radulović brought me some biscuits. We touched some tainted women and we bought some chocolate. From Zlogov we brought full bags of food. On the square there were several Ruthenians strung up. On the main road we were bombed with three heavy grenades. There were already many dead. We were used to it.

Ležim, a moji prozori su žute boje. I, kukavan i bolestan, ja vidim kako iz mračnih podrumskih prozora viri zima. A ovo žuto lišće puno snega prati me već tri godine i pada mi na grudi i ubija me. Ležim i vidim samo drveće kroz prozor. Razgovaramo. Lišće mi njiše zbogom i pada. A zar nije ljubav samo lišće? (15).

I am lying down, and my windows are yellow. And, cowardly and ill, I can see the winter peering in from the dark cellar windows. And these yellow leaves full of snow have been following me for three years and falling on my chest and killing me. I am lying down and I can see only the trees through the window. We talk. The leaves are swinging their farewells and falling. And isn't love just leaves?

Da, sećam se. U primorju je sad proleće. A ja ležim i čitam novine i gledam džakuljice pune snega na grudima. Čitam novine i sećam se. Vojnik sam, niko i ništa nisam i sve što se desilo ne razumem. Po Petrogradu lopi krv. Maksim Gorki zove sve jadnike kući a u Pešti u sabornici sedi baron Rajačić bled i podrugljivo nasmejan. A oko njega skaču



i viču: "Izdajice, izdajice." Ja spuštam novine i gledam u mutne krovove. Vidim snežne poljane. A na Jadranu ide sad proleće po vodi od otoka do otoka. Po krovovima pada neka žuta tama zorom, topla, blaga, sjajna (16).

Yes, I remember. On the coast it is now spring. And I am lying down and reading the newspaper and looking at the small bags full of snow clutched at our chests. I am reading the newspaper and remembering. I am a soldier, I am no-one and nothing and everything which has happened I don't understand. Blood is spilt in Petrograd. Maxim Gorky is calling the wretched souls home and in the parliament at Pest sits Baron Rajačić, pale and ridiculed. And around him they jump and shout "Traitor, traitor." I put the newspaper down and stare at the hazy roofs. I can see the snowy fields. And on the Adriatic spring is now moving across the water from island to island. A yellow gloom at dawn, warm, mild, shining, falls across the roofs.

The diary contains many such passages in which certain details appear in rapid succession: "we touched some tainted women and we bought some chocolate"; "...and my windows are yellow"; "on the coast it is now spring". Such details contribute to the depiction of the diarist's mood, and sometimes disrupt the passage between the time of writing and the time of the events, since it is not always clear to which time scheme they belong. In other words, they disrupt the sequence of actions. They reinforce the conclusion that the "diary is not the clear account of an individual destiny, but largely that of a mood" (17). Whether the diary is the statement of a single mood with its own internal

coherence, or the expression of changing moods will determine whether the diary is an expression of sumatraism's simultaneity or rhythm. The ubiquitous connectives "i" and "a" minimise logical and causal connections between the statements. Action is thus presented with "maksimalna izolovanost" ("maximum isolation" 18) in hermetic units, with no indication of progression from one to the next.

The paratactic and inverted sentence structures, and the repetition of similar lexical or syntactic elements tend to produce a similar effect in which action is minimised. The main verb in a sentence traces the forward movement of action into the future, but in many sentences the main verb is displaced, so that time as the index of change is arrested.

Paratactic structures:

Tražim dah, izgubio sam ga negde u lišću (19) (instead of "koji sam...").

I am trying to get my breath, I lost it somewhere in the leaves.

Budim se zorom i čitam Dantea. Kažu, tako treba (p66) (instead of "kažu da...").

I wake at dawn and read Dante. They say, as one should.

Sećam se, sećam se, tada mi je majka bila prvi put teško bolna (p68) (instead of "sećam se da...").

I remember, I remember, that was when my mother was seriously ill the first time.

Displaced elements of sentence:

O toj je slici mučeći se dugo pričala i molila me je da je držim uvek na mom stolu (p28).

About that picture in great torment for a long time she spoke and asked me to keep it always on my table.

Ja sam umoran, sav podbuo i slab odlazio i vraćao se, a ona me je čekala i grlila me još sa vrata (p42).

Tired, all bloated, and weak, I would leave and return, and she would wait for me and embrace me while still at the door.

Bio je negde na bojištu sudija (p43).

He was somewhere on the battlefield a judge.

Stajao sam i gledao u taj pun snega grad (p45).

I was standing and looking at the full of snow town.

Kiša, ona strašna poljska, padala je večerom, a po hodnicima su lutale, lupajući štakama, senke koje su pljuvale krv (p46).

Rain, that terrible Polish kind, fell in the evening, and along the corridors wandered, hitting out with their crutches, shadows who were spitting blood.

Repetitions:

Ona mi mnogo govori o njenom (sic) sinčiću. Mi mnogo govorimo o njenom sinčiću (p46).

She speaks to me a great deal about her little son. We speak a great deal about her little son.

Otišao bih nekud daleko i ne bih se osvrnuo. Otišao bih nekuda u žuto lišće... (p48).

I would go off somewhere far away and I would not turn back. I would go off somewhere into the yellow leaves...

One me je zagrlila odmah. Ona je lepša sad. Ona je sad puna tame. Ona ima nečeg bolesna što pre nije imala, nečeg što se dobija od stida (p49).

She embraced me immediately. She is more beautiful now. She is now full of darkness. She has something ill about her which she did not have before, something which one gets from shame.

Billi smo smešni, i mladi, ah tako mladi (p51).

We were absurd, and young, oh so young.

Noći su ledene i zvezdane. Ostavljaju otvorene prozore. Kažu led i zvezde će mi izlečiti pluća (p65).

The nights are icy and starry. They leave the windows open. They say the ice and the stars will cure my lungs.

U starim mrtvim rečima volim moju sudbinu, u oblacima misao mog stoleća a u osmehu mome skamenjenu snagu roda mog (p65).

In the old dead words I love my fate, in the clouds the thought of my age and in my smile the petrified strength of my people.

Radoje Simić discusses many similar points, with the intention of establishing the continuity of Crnjanski's style in his four major novels. His approach is descriptive of the linguistic patterns in Crnjanski's sentence structures rather than interpretative. However, he comes to certain general conclusions about Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću which help to reinforce the point of our analysis: principally, the static nature of

action, the focus on particular motifs, and the tendency for language to imitate patterns of speech or dialogue rather than the conventions of written prose (20).

The static nature of the action is particularly evident in those sentences where the main verb is omitted. Significantly, the first sentence which states the mood of resignation dominating the text contains no verb, "Jesen, i život bez smisla" ("Autumn, and life without meaning" 21). The same sentiment is repeated later when the diarist writes "Da jesen je. Opet život bez smisla" ("Yes it is autumn. Again life without meaning" 22). Other sentences also contain no verb, as in "Bilo je Juna (sic). Veseo dan. Vidovdan" ("It was in June. A happy day. St Vitus' Day" 23). The effect of such sentences is compounded by others in which the main verb of one sentence is used to govern the one following. For example, the diarist writes "Kome ja ovo pišem? Mladićima, mom sinu bledom i napaćenom" ("Who am I writing this for? For young men, for my son pale and exhausted" 24) and:

Hoću da Vam pričam.

O jednom čoveku, kojeg ne mogu da zaboravim, i koji mi beše više nego brat. Jedan jedini čovek. Jedan mladić u svetu (25).

I want to tell you.

About a man, whom I cannot forget, and who was more to me than a brother. The one and only man. The only young man in the world.

Such sentences emphasise the retardation of action, and

with it the passing of time. Time is compressed and alternates only between the now of writing and the not-now of times past remembered by the diarist. There is an uncertain wavering between the two times. The two times are connected by the presence of the diarist. His presence is highlighted by the oral tone of delivery implicit in the disruption of the conventions of the written language. For example, the omission of main verbs is more characteristic of speech than writing, underlining the presence of the diarist.

Sometimes the repetitions of lexical items in the same or different syntactic formations are separated by one or more paragraphs. Questions concerning the direction and worth of his own life and existence in general occur to him and he writes "Ko zna šta je Život... Ko zna šta je Život" ("Who knows what life is... Who knows what life is" 26). These questions are repeated on the following page in a slightly different formula, "Život? Ko zna šta je to" ("Life? Who knows what it is"). Kalezić remarked that such repetitions appear with various gaps "poslije nekoliko redaka, češće poslije nekoliko stranica, a ima i slučajeva kad se pretapaju i poslije većih odlomaka" ("after several lines, more frequently after several pages, and there are instances when they *are faded in* following even longer extracts" 27). Such repetitions function as motifs in the text. There is frequent mention of the word "ležim"

("I am lying down"), usually associated with "prozor" ("window") through which the diarist can see roofs, trees and the approach of dawn, and of "jesen" ("autumn"). They sometimes refer to the time when he was in hospital and sometimes to times when at home writing his diary. They hold in common an expression of passivity and resignation, which link the temporally disparate episodes. Their meanings and significance are enclosed within the consciousness or sub-consciousness of the diarist himself.

Some of the more frequent motifs occur in the first few pages of the diary and are repeated in the last few pages. The motif "slike cara Dušana" ("pictures of Tsar Dušan") occurs in connection with home, family, and the nation, "bele rukavice" ("white gloves") in connection with his mother or himself, "seobe/seliti se" ("emigration/to emigrate") in connection with his family, nation, and his own experiences of travel away to war and return home, "prazne crkve" and "zvon" ("empty churches" and "bell<sup>-ringing</sup>") are reminders of home. Their repetition both at beginning and end of the diary give the impression that the mood being expressed does not change substantially, and signals the close of the diary, which is otherwise an intrinsically open-ended genre. Although the different episodes which he relates are expressions of different degrees of happiness, sadness, resignation, there is a tendency for him to

return to dwell on the same preoccupations.

The motifs and repetitions in the text provide a level of coherence above that of the action. Time in the text is not measured by the diarist's progression from one action to another. In fact, on the linguistic and narrative level the link between action and time is disrupted, and reformulated in relation to the diarist. The important temporal relationship is between the time of writing and the disparate times recalled in memory. The relationship between the time of events and the time of their narration is also a distinctive feature in the organisation of material in the two later novels, Druga knjiga seoba and Roman o Londonu. Although it does play a part in the second novel, Seobe, there are other distinctive features associated with this novel.

Given that the organisation of the temporal scheme in the diary is the product of the diarist's own consciousness and his act of writing, we can isolate a group of significant phrases which recur in the text. The first is a comment on the passage of time, "Sve to nije važno, jer je prošlo" ("All that is not important, for it has passed" 28), repeated a few pages later as, "Sve je to davno prošlo i sve mi se čini tako smešno" ("All that passed long ago and everything seems so absurd to me" 29). The comment that what has passed is unimportant or absurd is a psychological defence which relegates events over which the diarist has lost control



to the insignificant. The confessional tone of the diary becomes a way of avoiding action, since what has happened cannot be changed, and whatever action is taken in the present will itself be consigned to the past and forgotten: "ja bih zaboravio sav svoj život, koji mi se činio i smešan i lud" ("I would forget my whole life, which seems to me both absurd and mad" 30); "sve će to proći" ("all that will pass" 31); "sve će to proći i sve će se to zaboraviti" ("all that will pass and all that will be forgotten" 32); and on the final page "Kažu, dve tri godine i sve ćemo zaboraviti" ("They say, we shall forget everything in two or three years" 33).

In his assertion that all action is useless the diarist relates the endless transience of time to a moral sphere commenting, "Da, jesen je. Opet život bez smisla. Sve to ne zavisi od mene ni od nje" ("Yes, it is autumn. Again life without sense. All that does not depend on me or on her" 34). Here the diarist is referring to his courtship of Maca. The comment that life does not depend on the individuals involved is a consequence of his submission of all action to the transience of time, evident in such phrases as "Život se ne menja. On prolazi" ("Life does not change. It passes by" 35). Passivity and resignation remain as his only positive responses. The diarist goes a step further in his more frequent comment that he no longer knows what is good and what is bad. He denies not only

the validity of action, but also the moral judgement which underpins the choice of action: "I ništa me više ne vezuje ni za dobro ni za zlo" ("And nothing connects me any longer with good or with evil" 36); "Ne znam više šta je dobro, a šta zlo" ("I no longer know what is good, and what evil" 37). The nature of time as felt and expressed by the diarist results in his loss of will to act, thus reinforcing the impression that time is a psychological category.

The diarist does not see his life and future as completely hopeless. However, the better times will only come in a future age after he has gone: "Ja vidim da će doći jedno bolje stoleće. Ono uvek dolazi" ("I can see that a better century will come. It is always coming" 38); "Ali će doći lepše stoleće, ono uvek dolazi" ("But a more beautiful century will come, it is always coming" 39); "Za nama će doći bolje stoleće, ono uvek dolazi" ("After us will come a better century, it is always coming" 40); "Mi ćemo izumreti i doći će bolje stoleće, ono uvek dolazi" ("We shall die and a better century will come, it is always coming" 41). The principle of simultaneity which dominates the diary, in which the dominant mood is the expression of a single moment measured by the intensity of the diarist's feelings and emotive responses, contrasts with this suggestion of an open-ended future. The diarist reveals a change in his mood from the resignation which

dominates much of the text to one of defiance in his final sentence "Ali ako umrem, pogledaću poslednji put nebo, utehu moju, i smešiću se" ("But if I die, I shall look for the last time on the sky, my consolation, and I shall smile" 42). He delivers his statement with reference to the sky, the universal symbol of infinity in which he finds consolation for present suffering. These suggestions of change and open-ended time indicate the inclusion of the temporal principle of rhythm into a work which is otherwise dominated by the principle of simultaneity.

In Dnevnik o Čarnojevuću Crnjanski's use of language and organisation of the narrative reflect the disturbed consciousness of the diarist himself. Time is ordered as a psychological category. The order of his memories, the repetition of motifs, and the final suggestions of hope for an open-ended future are features of the novel's structure which deny any assumptions that events have a unifying logic, and that temporal sequence is a causal relationship. The temporal order required by classical poetics is disrupted in the diary, as Mendilow remarks on time in modernist literature generally:

The old Aristotelian definition of beginning, middle and end, and the unity of action no longer hold good (43).

The assessment of time as a psychological category in this novel links the issue of time to the issue of the self. The diary is titled Diary about Čarnojević. In addition to the diarist, Čarnojević, there are two other characters, and these are Petar Rajić, and the Dalmatian sailor of the diarist's dream. The identity of the diarist has been disputed in critical writings. Nikola Milošević maintains that Čarnojević provides the focus of attention (44), while Novica Petković maintains that Rajić is the fictional author of the diary. That is not to say that Rajić is a conventional literary character. Leovac says as much when he remarks that Rajić "nije romaneskni lik koji razvija radnju" ("is not a novelistic character who develops the action" 46). Novica Milić has recently questioned the evidence for suggesting Rajić as the narrator (47). Rajić's name is given in full only in an ironic tone, on the patient's chart hanging by his bed in hospital, and it is then indicated twice more. The issue of identity and the self in the novel is strengthened by a deliberate blurring of the distinction between these characters. The "I" of the novel refers to Čarnojević as the diarist. Rajić comes to personify the diarist's memory of self, while the sailor who is referred to as "he" comes to represent an ideal image which Čarnojević has

of self in his dream. However, the conventions of using the first and third persons is "the most overworked distinction" in literature (48). The issue of time in Crnjanski's first novel is closely linked to the issue of the self in relation to time, that is to the ways in which Čarnojević sees himself in past, present, and future.

### Seobe

Crnjanski's second novel differs in many ways from his first. It is not a first-person confession, being written in the third person with three major characters, Vuk Isaković, his wife Dafina, and brother Arandel. It contains many passages which are dominated by the point of view of the characters concerned, and also passages in which the narrative is dominated by an unseen observer. The unseen observer of the novel has two functions. He links those sections which are narrated by the characters. He also knows more than the characters themselves could know, and with the benefit of hindsight supplies information concerning the

historical background against which the novel is set; this feature gives his narrative a neutral flavour in contrast to the psychologically charged responses from the characters. In relation to the events of the novel this narrator is temporally removed at some point in the future. The characters, on the other hand, introduce a synchronic point of view. The two points of view are placed in different temporal relationships to the events of the novel, and are marked by different types of sentence structure.

The opening of the novel provides an example of the stark contrast between the two types of sentence structure. Vuk Isaković has mustered his regiment prior to marching off to war. The novel opens with his waking on that morning from a disturbed sleep, in anticipation of departure and because of the pain in his leg caused by a horse which kicked him. In his fitful sleep he has been dimly aware of sounds outside and of images from his dreams:

Isprekidan lavež pasa i isprekidan poj  
petlova, još od ponoći, ali dalek. Tup  
udar kopita, međutim, kao pod zemljom,  
čuje se jednako, u blizini, pod snom  
(49).

The incessant barking of dogs and the  
incessant crowing of cocks, from midnight  
on, but in the distance. The dull thud  
of hooves, however, as if underground,  
can be heard continuously, nearby, and  
beneath his dream.

Pri tom, za taj tili čas, dok opet ne  
usni, šta sve ne ugleda u polusnu! Reku  
što pod bregom šumi, ispunivši svu noć.

Porazlivenim vodama, u rupama i jarugama, mesečine (50).

With that, within the moment, until he fell asleep again, what did he not see in his half-sleep! The river which murmurs under the bank, having filled the whole night. With flood waters, in the holes and ditches, of the moonlight.

These passages contain the minimum use of verbs. The only verb in the first passage is an impersonal reflexive verb, which does not even identify the waking figure. In the second passage, the figure is identified only as an unnamed "he". The main verb is omitted from the first sentence of the first passage. In the second passage, the second and third sentences are dependent on the main verb of the first sentence. The lack of verbs emphasises the point of view of the anonymous figure in a way which is reminiscent of Crnjanski's style in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću. The actions are reflections in the character's mind, the sequence of which is uncertain.

However, in contrast to Crnjanski's first novel, there is an observer-narrator in Seobe who takes over the narration once Vuk wakes:

Ležao je u mraku širom otvorenih očiju, začuđen, i drhćući od hladnoće. Nije više sanjao. Poj petlova i lavež pasa čuo je. Žena, koja mu je bila zaspala na ruci, disala mu je na grudi. I šum što izazva, proteglivši vrat, ču, jer tolika još tišina bila je pred kućom. Kroz pukotinu čamovine, međutim, primeti tanku svetlost što je prodirala i osvesti se sasvim. Bilo je vreme da idu (51).

He lay in the darkness with his eyes wide

open, in surprise, and shivering from the cold. He was no longer dreaming. He could hear the cocks crowing and the dogs barking. His wife, who had fallen asleep on his arm, was breathing on his chest. And having stretched his neck he could hear the murmur calling, for there was still so much silence in front of the house. Through the crack in the wood, however, he noticed a thin stream of light break through and he came to his senses completely. It was time to go.

Each sentence contains its own main verb, giving the impression of a series of actions. Although some are taking place simultaneously they are narrated as separate events, or as if noted in sequence by an unseen observer. The temporal order of events is clarified by the use of the pluperfect in "who had fallen asleep", a tense which is not commonly used in modern Serbo-Croat, and the past gerund "having stretched". Although the use of verbs such as "he heard" indicates the point of view of the character, his point of view is controlled and ordered, in contrast to the impression of chaotic sense perceptions in the two passages quoted earlier. The difference between the immediate point of view of the character's consciousness and the controlled narrative of the narrator is manifested in the use of verbs in the two types of sentence structures.

The characters are separated by a great distance, with Dafina and Arandel in Zemun, and Vuk away at the war. The observer-narrator traces the course of events in both loci of action. His voice frequently dominates the openings of chapters:



Ušli su u Pečuj tako razbarušeni, neoprani, mokri, i pobesneli, da su se deca rasplakala, a žene koje behu istrčale, pred kuće, da ih vide, razbežale vrišteći, u komšiluk. Pevahu vičući, a koračahu, umorni, i izgladneli, tako žurnim korakom da su se, opkoljeni srebrom okićenim oficirima, činili kao hajka gladnih pasa, koje vode, pritegnute na lancu, u lov (52).

They entered Pécs so dishevelled, grimy, wet, and angry-looking, that the children burst into tears, while the women who had run out in front of their houses to see them fled screeching into the backstreets. They sang loudly and marched, tired and hungry, with such a rapid step they they seemed like a pack of hungry dogs straining at the leash being led out by their richly uniformed officers swathed in silver.

This is the observer-narrator's description of Vuk's regiment as they arrive at regional headquarters. The narrator has set the scene for the action in regional headquarters. Subsequently, the events of the two loci of action continue to be separated into different chapters, when he establishes not only the scene but also the time of the events to be narrated. Chapter Five opens thus:

Dok je gospođa Dafina pala šaka svome deveru, dotle je Vuk Isakovič, sa svojim ljudima, bio počeo da se penje u Stajersku (53).

While the lady Dafina fell into her brother-in-law's hands, Vuk Isakovič, with his men, had begun to climb into Styria.

The previous chapter of the novel related the events surrounding the adulterous night Dafina spent with her brother-in-law, their reactions the following day, and

Dafina's fall which causes her death. Chapter Five switches to Vuk and his men abroad, their place and time in relation to events at home being established by the narrator. The narrator's awareness of the simultaneous events taking place at home and abroad contrasts with the complete lack of contact between the characters, as he says of Vuk, "Ne pade mu ni na um da pomisli da ga žena, kod kuće, vara" ("It did not even occur to him to think that his wife was deceiving him at home" 54).

The observer-narrator not only fixes the characters in time in relation to the events of the novel, he also marks the passage of time. He supplies information about the historical events surrounding the campaign abroad, for example in the opening of Chapter Seven he writes:

Cela kampanja po Loreni, u kojoj se borio, na čelu vojske, sa svojih trista biranih vojnika i blagorodni Vuk Isaković, svršila se za nekoliko nedelja. Predvoditelj prethodnice, feldmaršallajtnant baron Johan Leopold Berenklaui, uzeo je, prepadom, šančeve oko Majnce, pa mu se i varoš predade. Karlo Lotarinški tad pređe Rajnu sa ostalom vojskom. Posle tri dana, izmenivši svega nekoliko metaka iz pištolja sa francuskim husarima, udoše i u Vorms, a po kiši, pod provalom oblaka, da ne ispališe nijednu pušku, u Špajer. Posle tri dana odmora utaboriše se pod gradom Svetog Luja i tu im zagusti. Kanonada ja trajala danima, bombe su padale u logor. Francuzi zagatiše reku, te se razli i poplavi kola, konje, topove, tako da se umalo ne podaviše u blatu. Pošto nisu uspeli da osvoje na juriš grad, oni ga zaobiđoše i dođoše pod Štrasburg, baš kad je tamo došao francuski kralj (55).

The whole campaign through Lorraine, in which, at the head of the army, with his three hundred picked soldiers, also fought the noble Vuk Isaković, ended in a few weeks. The leader of the vanguard, Field Marshal Lieutenant Baron Johan Leopold Berenklaui, took by assault the trenches around Mainz, and the town was surrendered to him. Then Charles of Lorraine crossed the Rhine with the remaining forces. After three days, having exchanged in all a few pistol shots with the French hussars, he entered Worms, and in the rain, a cloudburst, without firing a single rifle, into Speyer. After three days rest they encamped around the town of Saint Louis and here the situation became critical. The cannonade lasted for days, bombs fell into the camp, the French dammed the river, and it overflowed and flooded the wagons, horses, cannon, so they they almost drowned in mud. Since they did not succeed in taking the town by storm, they skirted round it and arrived at Strasbourg, just when the French king arrived there.

The observer-narrator specifies that the campaign lasted "a few weeks", and that the events took place in a particular sequence when he uses such words and phrases as "then" and "after three days". Time for him is an index by which to measure the duration and sequence of events.

In their personal experience the characters mark the passage of time in very different ways. For Vuk the long march to the campaign is a period of extreme boredom which seems endless:

Stenjući od bola u kolima, činilo mu se kao da već nekoliko dana pada neka kiša, kojoj nema kraja, u kojoj se slivaju sa njega ne samo žena i deca, već i bivši njegov život i sve što je video. Videvši iz kola, nad visokim brdima kako prolaze

oblaci, učini mu se da se slivaju dole, kao i ogromni potoci kamenja sa vrhova, pod kojima su belila se čitava polja dubokog snega i velikih, tamnih senki stena.

Kroz jelovinu, on se peo za pukom, izgubiv posle uopšte iz vida zemlju i sela, dole. Cvrčanje levči, paoca i glavčina uspavljivalo ga je kao i neprekidni šum, pod kolima, opalih grančica i igala, što su bile posule planinu, meke kao mahovina, tako da je točak zapadao čitav pedalj (56).

Groaning with the pain in the wagon, it seemed to him as if the rain, to which there was no end, had been falling for several days, and in which not only his wife and children, but also his former life and everything which he could see flowed off him. Having seen from the wagon, above the high hills, the clouds passing by, it seemed to him that they flowed below, like huge torrents of stone from the hilltops, under which whole fields of deep snow and of tall, dark shadows of cliffs shone white.

Through the pine forest he climbed behind his regiment, having lost from sight completely the land and villages below. The squeaking of the boards, spokes and hubs lulled him to sleep as did the continual murmuring, under the wagon, of fallen twigs and needles, which covered the mountain, soft as moss, as the wheel sank one whole hand span.

Vuk's journey is measured by the alternating periods of pain and sleep which punctuate the progress of the cart. The rain, which seems to have been falling for days, unlike the narrator's precise measurement of the duration of events, contrasts with the emphasis on the movement of the cart by each turn of the wheel. His memories of his family and whole past life which he sees in each passing moment slip away from his consciousness.

### CHAPTER THREE

In Vuk's consciousness time is an uncertain measure of duration and sequence.

The sentence structures in the passage quoted above do not differ greatly from others, but the internal point of view of Vuk is indicated in the use of the verb "it seemed to him", which indicates the "internal consciousness" (57) of a character. Verba sentiendi are used frequently to indicate the narration of the text from the internal point of view of Arandel and Dafina. When Vuk goes to war, Dafina goes to stay in Arandel's house and wait for her husband's return. Arandel reflects on the years over which he has been obsessed by his sister-in-law. From the time of her arrival at the house Arandel's measure of time is guided both by his memory of what she has been in his life, and by the desire to possess her:

Želeći da što pre dobije njen pristanak, on je obasu poklonima, pokušav dvosmislenim rečima i ljubaznošću, da mu ona da kao neki znak. Ali mu taj znak ne dođe (58).

Wishing to obtain her assent, he showered her with gifts, having tried with his ambiguous words and kindness to force from her some sort of sign. But that sign never came.

The opening word "wishing" indicates that the narrator is narrating from Arandel's point of view. Dafina is aware of her brother-in-law's attentions and the reasons for them. For her too, the time she spends in the house is measured only by the anticipation of what might

happen:

Želela je da vidi šta će joj dever učiniti, kad jednog dana potpuno poludi. Želela je da se to dogodi, prosto, od dosade, zbog praznine u kojoj, bezdanoj, činjaše joj se katkad da visi glavačke (59).

She wanted to see what her brother-in-law would do to her, when one day he goes completely mad. She wanted it to happen, simply, out of boredom, because of the infinite emptiness in which she sometimes felt herself hanging headfirst.

The characters reflect on past, present, and future as features of the same moment. Time for them is not the index by which to measure the duration and sequence of events. Time for them has no duration outside their memories, fears, and anticipations which shape the extension of the moment, and expose what Crnjanski refers to as "ritam svakog rasploženja" ("the rhythm of each mood" 60) in his essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'". On the other hand, the observer-narrator measures time by the calendar and traces the sequence of external events which mark the passage of time.

As in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću there are many sentences in Seobe which contain no finite verb. The bulk of such sentences are connected with Vuk and contrast with those sentences which mark the voice of the observer-narrator, as described at the beginning of this section with reference to the novel's opening. There is a tendency to link together two sentences with one main verb where a number of events or sensations are

simultaneous. The interruption of the flow of the narrative is very important to Crnjanski's use of language. Readers expect new sentences to introduce a new verb as a supplement to action already described or as a new departure in the description of what is taking place. This next quotation describes the scene in the courtyard of the Regional Commander's Headquarters the morning after Vuk's men have slipped into the town and caused havoc. The townspeople have come to register their complaints:

Dvorište popločano bilo je puno sluga, koji su spremali konje i velika, svečana kola. Trgovaca i zanatlija koji su došli da prijave krađe, i čitavih porodica, iz donjeg predgrađa, koje su bile dotrčale da se žale (61).

The flagged courtyard was filled with servants who were preparing the horses and the large, ceremonial coach. With merchants and tradespeople who came to report thefts, and with whole families from the lower town who had come running to register their complaints.

The first sentence introduces the main verb which also governs the second sentence, "was filled". The mutual dependence of the two subjects points to their close proximity, since Vuk saw the two events at the same time. However, their separation also shows them to be two actions which are not the same. The servants were in the yard when the townspeople arrived and they are there for different purposes.

The overall effect reflects the principles of both simultaneity and rhythm. These passages of greatest

syntactic fragmentation point to events which are happening at the same time. They are the thoughts and actions which, taken together, give a rounded picture of Vuk's emotional states, and the actions taking place around him. However, the picture is not one of Vuk in harmony with the world, but of his inner turmoil as he searches for a resolution to the changes which he feels in his life. At the Regional Commander's headquarters in Pécs Vuk is dressing for a regimental inspection. His thoughts wander and his mind is on matters which range back in time, while he is also aware of his present. It is interesting to note the variety of verb forms in these sentences:

Pred zoru, bio je sanjao o ženi i mislio je na nju i sad, posmatrajući kroz zamagljeno staklo svoga konja kome su sluge prale noge i tanke članke. Ali, setivši se dece, on zajeca poluglasno, pred vojnikom koji ga je oblačio. Taj poziv na vojnu, tako iznenada, pobrkao je bio sva njegova rešenja. U svađi s bratom, koji se bio naselio u Zemun, a rešio da se kupi jedna velika kuća u Budim gradu, on je želeo da izvuče sedam stotina dukata i da se odseli u Rusiju. Rusija mu se činjale kao jedna velika, nepregledna, zelena poljana, po kojoj će jahati (62).

Before dawn, he had been dreaming about his wife and was thinking about her even now, looking through the misty window at his horse whose legs and thin hocks the servants were washing. But, having recalled his children, he let out a moan half-aloud, in front of the soldier who was dressing him. The military call-up, so sudden, had disrupted all his intentions. In an argument with his brother, who had moved to Zemun, and had decided to have a large house in Budim



bought, he wanted to borrow seven hundred ducats and emigrate to Russia. Russia seemed to him like a huge, endless, green plain, over which he would ride.

Rather than omit verbs, this passage is suffused with them, and rarely are two identical forms found juxtaposed. It opens with pluperfect, then present gerund, then perfect tense. The second sentence begins with a past gerund, then aorist or present tense, then perfect tense, and so it continues. Each verbal element refers to a separate event or state, and their delineation by alternating verbal forms emphasises their separateness, but at the same time the mix of memory with events taking place in his room and outside his window highlights the fact that everything being recorded is taking place in Vuk's immediate consciousness.

The quotation above begins before Vuk gets dressed, when he had dreamt about his wife, about whom he is still thinking. However, the final clause of the first sentence focuses on a detail of the moment when the servants wash his horse's legs. The next sentence continues this association of his memories with the present through the detail of the soldier's presence in his room. The thought of his children reminds him of his brother, of the call for war, and his desire to emigrate to Russia. Russia is for Vuk a utopia where he will not be under pressure to fight wars in which he feels no personal investment, and where he will not be

under pressure to convert to Catholicism. The logical development of the main verbs from which ought to emerge the main information of the sentences, is broken, and the simultaneous sense impressions, memories and desires which form the dense structure of those few moments are highlighted.

Syntactic fragmentation and displacement of the verb becomes more pronounced in moments of greatest introspection, particularly in the scenes when Vuk and his men are away from home in those long spells of inactivity during which Vuk's tortuous reflections dominate the text:

Zadrigao od spavanja i odmora, otežao opet, nadosio bi se tad, svom snagom, u stišavanju i sumraku, kroz lupu i žagor logora, udarce kopita, klepetuša stoke, zvuke kovačkih nakovanja, u tihi, bezmernu zriku popaca, na celoj toj širokoj poljani, u bezdano ništavilo i prazninu, što ih beše iznenada, ali blizu, pred svojom starošću, ugledao (63).

Refreshed from sleep and rest, heavy again, he would have bent then, with his strength, in the calm and twilight, through the noise and murmuring of the camp, the stamping of hooves, the ring of cow bells, the sounds of the blacksmith's anvil, into the quiet, immeasurable chirping of crickets, on the whole of that broad field, into the endless nothingness and emptiness, that he had suddenly, but close by, before his old age, seen.

In the above example the awkwardness of the English translation is not a reflection of the Serbo-Croat original. However, it is important to note that the

main verb is deferred to the end of the sentence which "prebacuje težište iskaza na nominalni deo" ("transfers the balance of the statement to the nominal part" 64). In such passages the significance of the action is minimised, and the presence of the character maximised.

The projection of character point of view is central to the compositional design of the novel, whether graphically in separate chapters or paragraphs, by the use of verba sentiendi, or by syntactic fragmentation. The characters influence the temporal structure of the novel by introducing a "modifying temporal flow" (65) to the chronology of events as traced by the observer-narrator. They each inscribe into the novel their own measurements of duration and their own sequence of events. It is particularly the use of specific sentence structures which struck previous critics such as Milan Bogdanović in his review of the novel:

Miloš Crnjanski se u znatnoj meri odvađa od mirne i racionalne rečenice našeg savremenog književnog jezika, dajući jednu drugu, koja je sasvim nervozna, emotivna, potencirana (66).

Miloš Crnjanski has moved considerably away from the calm and rational sentence of our contemporary literary language, supplying another one, which is completely nervous, emotive, emphatic.

Crnjanski's use of language has been commented on many times by critics of Seobe, who see it as poetic and lyrical. However, it has been shown here that the

manipulation and displacement of the syntax of the novel is part of a wider design to emphasise character point of view, and to contrast the characters' time consciousness with that of the observer-narrator's linear chronology of events, affirming Novica Petković's remark that in Seobe "svi stepeni sintaksičkog izdvajanja i osamostaljivanja postaju aktivna sredstva umetničkog opisivanja" ("all degrees of syntactic division and autonomy become active means of artistic description" 67). The narrator's point of view on the temporal plane is diachronic in that he describes the passage of time and the changing events which mark its passing, linking together time and action. While the characters introduce a synchronic view of time in which their past experiences and expectations for the future condition their emotional response of the moment. For them time is an effect of the self. The compressed psychological time on which we commented in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću surfaces in Seobe alongside linear chronology.

Vuk, Dafina, and Arandel each live their own experience of time passing with hardly any reference to the others. Each character participates in an individual capacity, applying the experience of different memories, and expecting one set of consequences which may or may not coincide with the expectations of others. There is no linearity which is

the passing of an event recognised by all. Each character experiences differently what is happening, and constructs around what is happening a past and future which may be totally at odds with the assumptions of the other characters involved. There is no unity of time in which all the characters feel themselves progressing. The world of the novel is not a single entity, but three separate worlds, constructed by the characters as they reflect in memory on the significant experiences which have lead them to this point in time, and from which they expect different futures. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the attitudes of the two brothers to Dafina, and her attitude towards them.

Of the two brothers Arandel met Dafina first. He discovered her in the household of a merchant who owed him money. Arandel hoped that a wife would act as a calming influence on Vuk, whom he had to help out of trouble on many occasions, either by paying his gambling debts or securing his release from prison for brawling. He was himself attracted to her from the beginning, evident in the remark that "dopade mu se devojka, jer beše mlada, visoka, zdrava i jer je uporno ćutala, svojim velikim, modrim očima" ("he liked the girl, for she was young, tall, healthy and for she maintained a stubborn silence, with her large, blue eyes" 68). His early note of her physical appearance was transformed into an obsessive desire for her as time passed, and he

felt obliged to leave her and his brother. He returned, but his desire was unabated: "Kad se po drugi put vrati i vide je sa malim detetom, mal ne zaplaka. Toliko beše vedrog, nebesnog pogleda, čistih ruku i grla" ("When he returned for the second time and saw her with the small child, he almost burst into tears. She had such a clear, heavenly appearance, with pure hands and throat"

69). He became more infatuated:

Posle tih mirnih dana, pod belim oblacima bagrema, mada on to ne primeti, poče činiti, u kući bratovljevoj, zlo. Sve češće dodirivaše joj ruke, kosu, pleća, pa i pas (70).

After those peaceful days, under the white clouds of the acacia, although he did not notice it, he began to do evil in his brother's house. He touched her hands, hair, shoulders, and her waist more often.

As a result he felt compelled to go away again.

Arandel measures time in relation to his contacts with Dafina. His next contact with his brother and sister-in-law came when Vuk was preparing to go to fight in Italy and he brought his wife to Vienna:

Brat mu je bio ogroman i još lep, mada beše otežao i sasvim prosedeo. A ona ga je volela žarom, koji mu se učini životinjski i bljutav. Ljubili su se i pred njim, a stiskali su se i stezali svaki čas. Celu noć on je čuo njino šaputanje i gukanje (71).

His brother was large and handsome, although he had grown heavier and was quite grey. And she loved him with a passion, which seemed to him animalistic and tasteless. They kissed even in front of him, and they would embrace and squeeze each other at every moment. All

night he listened to her whispering and cooing.

Vuk went to war and Arandel's desire for Dafina abated when he saw her alone, without Vuk, pining for him. However, when Vuk was called to war again, Arandel offered his house as a refuge for Dafina and her children. His obsession for his sister-in-law is as strong as before, and now, living under the same roof, Arandel's sense of time passing is measured only by his growing desire to possess her. His intention is to win her for one night, then leave.

Vuk has a different measurement of time when he recalls his past and his wife. He was more attached to his father and the Serbian military tradition than Arandel. He fought in Serbia during the Austrian wars against the Turks, and dreamt of the time when he and his people would be able to return home and reclaim their homeland. However, times have changed and the Habsburgs have turned their attention to the West, no longer encouraging their Serbian regiments against the Turks. Vuk is discouraged and thinks that his regiment will be disbanded and the military tradition which he has inherited will be wiped away by the authorities. His marriage was happy in the beginning, but his wife and children became a burden to him in the constant uprooting and moving forced on him by his military career. He measures the years of their marriage, in fact, according to the four times he had to leave them.

go abroad, and fight (72). And his thoughts for the future exclude Dafina as he reflects that either he will never return from this war, or that he will take his people to Russia. He has grown tired of his wife, annoyed by her entreaties whenever he left her. When leaving for the fourth time, he arranges for his brother to come and together they contrive for Vuk to depart before Dafina can realise he has gone. Both brothers are afraid of her "plahe ćudi" (~~"unpredictable"~~ "moods" 73).

Dafina, on the other hand, counts the passage of years with Vuk in relation to his changing attitude towards her. The beginning of their marriage was a happy time, she recalls riding out in the countryside with him. But the change occurred when "on prvi put ode u rat, a ona prvi put rodi. Iz rata se bio vratio ugojen i ćudljiv" ("he went to war for the first time and she had their first child. He had come back from the war fat and moody" 74). He involves himself more with his land and people, becomes a major benefactor to the local church, and continues his military career. He is hardly attentive to her at all, and Dafina feels that he regards her simply as one of the household effects. When he goes to war for the third time Dafina's attitude has changed. This is the time when they go to Vienna and Arandel sees her constantly cooing over his brother:

Kad je po treći put odlazio, ona više i nije pokušavala iskreno da ga zadrži. Neiskrena i lažljiva, činila se da ga strasno ljubi, ali taj plač kojim je



zalivala svoje poljupce nije više bio gorak (75).

*On leaving* for the third time, she no longer even tried to detain him sincerely. Insincere and lying, she pretended to kiss him passionately, but her weeping in which she steeped her kisses was no longer bitter.

Both brothers have constructed an image of Dafina over time, which in neither case corresponds to the way that Dafina sees the development of her relationship with Vuk. They have made her into a femme fatale, an image which persists even after her death when the villagers fear that she returns from her grave each night as a vampire. But Dafina feels that as a woman she has no choices as she regards her position, "Nemaština, samoća, boleština, sve joj se to učini ženska sudbina" ("Poverty, loneliness, sickness, all that seemed to her the female lot" 76). She has no access to the power that money can bring, which Arandel has experienced as a successful merchant, nor to the status of a military and civic leader like her husband. Nothing in her life has occurred "po volji njenoj" ("according to her will" 77), and she feels that she has always been an object both when a child and as a wife:

Stvar, stvar je bila, kao što će to i njene kćeri biti, uzimane i ostavljene, iscmakane i odbačene, lizane i udarane, bez reda, bez smisla (78).

A thing, she has been a thing, as her daughters will be too, taken and abandoned, kissed and rejected, fondled and beaten, without sense, pointlessly.

### CHAPTER THREE

Her life has been led at the whim of men, and in particular the two brothers Arandel and Vuk.

When the characters introduce their own points of view in the text, they are not simply revealing that each of them measures and counts the duration and succession of events differently, but their measurement is in itself a reflection of the values which they see as underpinning their lives. As a merchant Arandel values objects, and his view of Dafina is as an object with which he has been obsessed over a long period. He is at last in a position to possess her. Vuk is more concerned with the general welfare of his people, while his wife, after the novelty of their early marriage, is a hindrance. His memories are conditioned by the number and duration of the campaigns he has fought, and the dream of first returning to Serbia, and then of emigrating to Russia. Dafina has no such goal in life, and her happiness is dependent on the provision made by men. Her memories are dominated by the changing attitudes shown to her by the men in her life. Time is linked to character in all Crnjanski's novels, not simply because of its measurement in the consciousness of characters, but also because they inscribe values into their views on time.

In Seobe, as in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, time is created by the characters, in the latter by the fictional author, and in the former by narrating from

### CHAPTER THREE

the points of view of the characters. However, the effect is more complicated in Seobe because of the multiplicity of characters. The individual timescales of the characters clash and combine in a fashion which reveals a multitude of moments. Each moment has its own duration, as it is narrated from a particular point of view. The same event when narrated from a different point of view reveals a separate order of duration and sequence. There is duration and sequence, but they do not represent total orders of time absorbing all characters and events into the same unity.

The observer-narrator in his ordering of the events of the novel introduces a rhythm which corresponds to Josipovici's description of time as a spiral. He introduces each episode before giving the narration over to the point of view of a particular character. Time is then measured by the emotional and psychological intensity felt by the character, before moving to another character. In Chapter Three when Dafina arrives at Arandel's house, Arandel's memories of his obsessive desire for his sister-in-law dominate the text. The narrative returns to Dafina and how she spends her days in his house. The change in point of view from one character to another is signalled by the observer-narrator returning the reader to Dafina's arrival:

Gospođa Dafina bila se preselila u kuću  
svog devera. Trebala je tu da preživi,

sa svojim ćerčicama, nekoliko meseci, pa možda i godina, dok joj se muž ne vrati iz rata. Trebala je tu da dočeka i svoj treći porođaj, jer beše u trećem mesecu blagoslovenog stanja, što priznade mužu tek pred polazak (79).

The Lady Dafina had moved into her brother-in-law's house. She was to live here, with her little daughters, for several months, perhaps even years, until her husband returned from the war. She was to wait here also for her third birth, for she was in the third month of the blessed state, which she had admitted to her husband just before his departure.

The tendency to return the narrative to a particular event is a feature of the compositional design of the novel as a whole. The narrator, when turning to another character or episode, usually opens by mentioning that the episode now being related happened at the same time as either the adulterous night which Dafina spent with Arandel, or Dafina's death.

The first and only night that Dafina spends with her brother-in-law is precipitated by the proximity of death. In Crnjanski's work Eros and Thanatos are frequently to be found in close proximity. Their affair begins when Arandel is almost drowned in an accident as he is sailing back across the river from Belgrade. Dafina's reaction is one of great fear at being left alone, her first thought being that she was in a house full of servants who were all strangers and therefore not to be trusted. In the emotional heat of the moment she is pushed over the brink of inhibition and her ambiguity towards Arandel is resolved. The mores of

### CHAPTER THREE

social custom in the patriarchal traditions of eighteenth-century Serbian life are dispelled when she orders that his body be taken to her chamber. On the following day she falls and as a result of being pregnant with Vuk's child she begins to haemorrhage and finally dies.

While these events have been taking place in Zemun, Vuk has been marching off to war. When the text returns to him it places him in relation to the time of those events. Following the description of Arandel nearly drowning, and Dafina's order that he be moved to her bedroom, the text returns to Vuk. He is described by the narrator on the appropriate day as he marches on with his regiment. This note occurs at the very end of the chapter and emphasises where Vuk is and what he is doing at that point:

Tog dana je Vuk Isaković prelazio sa pukom, celo prepodne, preko jednog uskog brvna, kod varoši Kremsminstera u Austriji. Bio se načinio nered među vojnicima (80).

That day Vuk Isaković spent the whole afternoon with his regiment crossing a narrow log bridge near the town of Kremsminster in Austria. Disorder had broken out amongst the troops.

The chapter closes with the remark that "Ne pada mu ni na um da pomisli da ga žena kod kuće vara" ("It never even occurred to him to think that his wife was deceiving him at home" 81).

There is a further reference to Vuk when the text

returns to him at the beginning of Chapter Five:

Dok je gospođa Dafina pala šaka svome  
deveru, dotle je Vuk Isaković, sa svojim  
ljudima, bio počeo da se penje u  
Štajersku (82).

While the Lady Dafina fell into her  
brother-in-law's hands Vuk Isaković had  
begun the climb into Styria with his men.

In the novel the relationship between Dafina and Arandel  
develops, but when the text returns to Vuk it returns to  
the beginning of the relationship. The text does not  
develop along linear lines at all. Vuk, Dafina and  
Arandel each introduce their individual timescale which  
encloses each of them in their separate worlds.  
However, a link between their individual destinies is  
made by the emphasis on their temporal relation to those  
two events.

The second event to form a temporal reference point  
is Dafina's death. The news is brought to Vuk in his  
camp by a merchant:

Neki krupan čovek tad, koga njegov vojnik  
zadrža da ne padne, reče mu da se zove  
Ahim Rigel, da je trgovac u Šerdingu, da  
je pre tri nedelje bio u Beču, gde ga je  
njegov poznanik Dimitrije Kopša, trgovac,  
molio da preko svojih prijatelja potraži  
Vuka Isakovića u Engelštatu, u vojsci,  
jer se ni na kakva pisma ne javlja, pa da  
mu kaže da su mu deca zdrava, kao i brat,  
a da mu je žena, gospođa Dafina, umrla  
(83).

Some bulky man then, held up by one of  
his soldiers to prevent him from falling,  
told him that he was called Ahim Rigel,  
that he was a merchant from Scherding,  
that he had been in Vienna three weeks  
before where his acquaintance Dimitrije Kopša,  
a merchant, had asked him to ask through

his friends for Vuk Isaković in Engelstadt, in the army, because he did not reply to any letters, and to tell him that his children, like his brother, are well, but that his wife, the lady Dafina, has died.

The long sentence and story about how the news was carried to Vuk, because he did not respond to any letters, emphasises the extent to which Vuk's inner crisis has cut him off from the world, and from his family. His isolation is confirmed by the equanimity with which he receives the news of her death. The next chapter returns to the day of Dafina's death and opens, "Dan kada je gospoži Dafini došao suđeni čas, bio je topal, letnji dan, krajem avgusta, posle tronedeljne suše" ("The day when the moment of judgement came for the Lady Dafina was a hot, summer day, at the end of August, after a three-week drought" 84). As with her adultery, Dafina's death is mentioned on more than one occasion to fix the point in time when other events take place:

Dok mu je snaha umirala, Arandel Isaković truckao se putem, u svom intovu, uveren da će ona i umreti (85).

While his sister-in-law was dying Arandel Isaković was being shaken along in his coach, convinced that she was going to die.

When the text returns to Vuk it again picks up the thread of the story concerning him from the point when he first heard of Dafina's death:

Vest da mu je žena, gospoža Dafina, umrla, primio je sasvim mirno. Činilo mu

se kao da je ta vest dolazi sa nekog drugog sveta. Iznuren od briga za pukom, nije imao snage da se za ženom ni zaplače (86).

He received the news that his wife, the Lady Dafina, had died with complete calm. It seemed to him that the news came from another world. Exhausted by worries about the regiment, he did not have the strength to shed even a tear for his wife.

The events of the adultery and death of Dafina are established as temporal reference points. Other events are described as happening before, after, or more usually, at the same time as her adultery and death. In this sense they correspond to what Seymour Chatman terms "kernels", that is events which chart the development of the story (87). In Seobe, all events are ordered in relation to these two events. They also function as what Roland Barthes terms "indices" of value and characterisation which integrate the lives of the characters beyond the temporal progress of the story (88).

Time in the novel progresses like a spiral, in that it keeps returning to a particular event or point in time, before continuing from the point of view of another character. The idea of return encapsulates the whole novel. There are a number of phrases found at the beginning and towards the end of the novel, which frame the events of the story. The refrain from the title of the first chapter "Beskrajni, plavi krug. U njemu, zvezda" ("An infinite circle of blue. In it, a star"



89) is also found as the refrain of the last chapter. The phrase "zatim potera konja kasom kroz prazninu" ("then he spurred his horse into a trot across the wilderness" 90) is repeated in both chapters; similarly with the sentence "Eto, pomisli, dovoljno je odseliti se iz jednog mesta, pa da sve što ostavljaš bude kao i da nije bilo" ("Now, he thought, it is enough to move on from one place, and everything which you leave behind is as if it never was" 91). All the events of the novel are framed by Vuk's departure for war and return one year later. The sentence in the first chapter "Tako je, godine 1744, u proleće, Vuk Isaković pošao na vojnu" ("So, in spring of the year 1744, Vuk Isaković set off for the war") is echoed in the last chapter as "Tako se 1745, u početku leta, Vuk Isaković vratio sa vojne" ("So, in the beginning of the summer of 1745, Vuk Isaković returned from the war" 92).

The impression that Vuk returns to the same situation that he had left is underlined in the remark "Sve je bilo kao i pri njegovom polasku" ("Everything was as on his departure" 93). Vuk set off in a melancholic mood, resigned to unhappiness, and he returns the same. The view that all is as when he left one year previously is a reflection of the emptiness which he sees in his life. The year has passed for Vuk as the manifestation of a single mood. However, a great deal has happened during that period, and there have

been many changes. Dafina has died. Arandel has left, and Vuk himself has suffered many bouts of tortured self-analysis. The principles of rhythm and simultaneity are combined in the novel as a whole. The spiral movement of time does not mean that the text returns to the same point, but that change and continuity co-exist. Simultaneity and rhythm are not discrete categories in Crnjanski's novel but merge one into the other.

The twin principles of simultaneity and rhythm are more in evidence in Seobe than in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću. The latter novel is dominated entirely by the narrating consciousness of the fictional author, making of time an effect of psychological intensity. This effect is also strongly felt in the characters of Seobe, but it is developed alongside the observer-narrator's linear sense of progressive time. On a linguistic and narrative level the complex compositional design of the novel is determined by the changes in point of view from the diachronic view of the observer-narrator to the synchronic views of the characters. Time is distributed amongst these different points of view. However, more significant than this structural feature of time, is the way in which the characters construct time according to the pressures of the moment, marking out past, present, and future, as a reflection of their values and desires.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Notes

1. M. Svetovski, "Miloš Crnjanski: Najviše povodom Dnevnika o Čarnojeviću, Misao, 1922, X, 3, p1450.
2. X. Z., "Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću", Misao, 1921, VI, 2, p159.
3. see Franjo Grčević, "Počeci proznog lirizma Miloša Crnjanskog", Zbornik zagrebačke slavističke škole, 1976, IV, 4, pp243-250.
4. X. Z., p159.
5. Slobodanka Glišić, "Moć i nemoć erotskog", Delo, 1977, XXIII, 11, p5.
6. II, p7.
7. II, p7.
8. II, p14.
9. II, p43.
10. II, p23.
11. II, p68, p73.
12. II, pp25-26.
13. Miodrag Petrović, "Dva romana Miloša Crnjanskog", Trajanje reči: Kritički ogledi i članci, Gradina, Niš, 1972, p90.
14. II, p18.
15. II, p48.
16. II, p73.
17. Celia Hawkesworth, "Distancing Devices in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, p37.
18. Radoje Simić, "Gramatička i intonacijska struktura proznog dela Miloša Crnjanskog", Književna istorija, 1978, XI, 41, p18.
19. II, p48. In the remainder of this section page numbers follow the quotations.

### CHAPTER THREE

20. Radoje Simić, pp20-21.
21. II, p7.
22. II, p45.
23. II, p8.
24. II, p23.
25. II, p50.
26. II, p67.
27. Vasilije Kazelić, "Uz književno djelo Miloša Crnjanskog", Književnost i jezik, 1961, VIII, 1, p24.
28. II, p11.
29. II, p14.
30. II, p36.
31. II, p48.
32. II, p74.
33. II, p90.
34. II, p45.
35. II, p82.
36. II, p25.
37. II, p48, p86.
38. II, p74.
39. II, p80.
40. II, p80.
41. II, p89.
42. II, p89.
43. A. A. Mendilow, Time and the Novel, Peter Nevill, London, 1952, p38.
44. Nikola Milošević, Roman Miloša Crnjanskog: Problem univerzalnog iskaza, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1970, pp 63-95.

### CHAPTER THREE

45. Novica Petković, Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 1985, pp5-6.
46. Slavko Leovac, Romansijer Miloš Crnjanski, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1981, p18.
47. Novica Milić, "Kako se zvao Čarnojević?", Književna reč, 10 February 1987, p6.
48. Wayne C. Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction, University of Chicago Press, 1983, p150.
49. III, p5.
50. III, p6.
51. III, p6.
52. III, p17.
53. III, p81.
54. III, p57.
55. III, p127.
56. III, p88.
57. Boris Uspensky, A Poetics of Composition, University of California Press, 1983, p85.
58. III, p54.
59. III, p56.
60. I, p210.
61. III, p25.
62. III, p26.
63. III, p145.
64. Radoje Simić, p32.
65. Eleanor N. Hutchens, "An Approach through Time", Towards a Poetics of Fiction, edited by Mark Spilka, Indiana University Press, 1977, p57.
66. Milan Bogdanović, "Seobe", Književnost između dva rata I, edited by Jovan Hristić, Srpska književnost u književnoj kritici, vol 7, Nolit, Belgrade, 1965, pp249-250.

This article is a revised version of the 1929

### CHAPTER THREE

review of the novel in which the quoted comment does not figure. See Milan Bogdanović, "Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe", Srpski književni glasnik, 1929, XXVIII, 4, pp293-299.

67. Novica Petković, p39.

68. III, p42.

69. III, p45.

70. III, p46.

71. III, p46.

72. III, p27.

73. III, p11.

74. III, p66.

75. III, p67.

76. III, p77.

77. III, p77.

78. III, p77.

79. III, p50.

80. III, p57.

81. III, p57.

82. III, p81.

83. III, pp157-158.

84. III, p159.

85. III, p166.

86. III, pp211-212.

87. Seymour Chatman, Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film, Cornell University Press, 1980, pp53-56.

88. Roland Barthes, "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives", Image - Music - Text, Fontana, London, 1982, pp95-96.

89. III, p5, p209.

### CHAPTER THREE

90. III, p16, p223.

91. III, p16, p223.

92. III, p16, p227.

93. III, p226.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CHAPTER FOUR

#### THE LATER NOVELS: TIME AND VOICE

In the previous chapter Crnjanski's use of language in his two early novels was examined for its relationship to the expression of time. It was concluded that in his first novel, Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, Crnjanski emphasises the representation of simultaneity between times as they occur in the mind of the diarist, and in the second novel the characters ascribe different meanings to relationships of sequence and duration. In both novels characters create individual time schemes. This feature of Crnjanski's work is embedded in the very language he uses, both in terms of sentence structure and in terms of narrative organisation. Crnjanski continues to use sentence structure in similar ways in his two later novels. He continues to disrupt normal syntax, to use "parcelacija rečenice" ("fragmentation of the sentence" 1), by deferring the verb and omitting verbs, to disrupt the sequence of linear time and to subordinate action to character. However, a more significant element in his later novels is the presentation of the narrating voices which organise the relationships of sequence and duration between events.



Voice, in this context, refers to various levels of speech, discourse and language. On one level voice is represented in the fictional voices of the characters. In direct and indirect speech the characters express the values which they hold, and their consequent views on the causes which underly the events which they experience. In Seobe this use of character point of view was countered by the voice of the observer-narrator. In Druga knjiga seoba there is more than one impersonal narrator, and each of them places the relationships between events, and between events and characters in different temporal designs. In Roman o Londonu the different voices which narrate the novel are largely connected with the main character himself, as aspects of his disturbed psyche. Crnjanski's final novel, in terms of its narrative organisation with respect to voice, displays some affinities with Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, but produces different effects and results. In his later phase, the tension deepens between his principles of simultaneity and rhythm, as expressions of continuity and change.

#### Druga knjiga seoba

Druga knjiga seoba is a novel which continues the family saga of the Isakovičs begun in Seobe. Vuk Isakovič had a dream that one day he would emigrate to Russia, and in Russia he would find the peace and

happiness which eluded him in his marriage and in the service of the Habsburg Empire. He never realised his dream. His nephews and his adopted son, Pavle Isakovič, continue to dream of emigrating to Russia in Druga knjiga seoba. The novel has often been described as epic (2). However, although there are many epic features in the work, there are others which counter them. The distinction between the epic and non-epic features is here considered as the effects of the narrating voices, which is particularly evident in the novel's organisation of time.

The events of the novel are not contained in one unifying temporal model. There are four narrating voices which organise the events of the novel according to the designs of different time schemes. They are here termed the chronicle, authorial, historical and epic voices. These terms are appropriate to the general function of each voice as a narrative device in Crnjanski's novel. The chronicle voice narrates events in their linear sequence. The authorial voice narrates events from the point of view of the characters. The historical voice is concerned with the historical and political details and causes which surround events. The epic voice represents a specific view of time expressed by Pavle Isakovič. They are distinguished one from the other by the temporal gaps which separate them from the events which they relate. Each voice also introduces a

## CHAPTER FOUR

different arrangement of sequence and duration to the action of the novel. The temporal gap and arrangement of sequence and duration determine the link between characters and events in terms of emplotment. In turn, the differences in temporal organisation are qualitative variations which ascribe different ways of linking the characters to the historical conditions which surround them.

The story covers the years 1752 to 1753, focusing on the four Isaković cousins, and particularly Pavle Isaković. The cousins are members of the Serbian community which settled in the Hungarian area of the Habsburg Empire. They are officers in the Serbian regiments employed by the Habsburgs to defend the frontier against the Ottoman Empire over the Danube. However, by the middle of the eighteenth century the Ottoman Empire is in decline and no longer poses a threat. The services of the frontier guards are no longer required, and the empire has decided to disband its Serbian regiments. At the same time, pressure is applied to force the Serbs to convert from the Orthodox to the Catholic faith. The Isaković family, whose fate symbolises the fate of the whole nation, regard imperial policy as a threat to their own sense of national identity. At the same time, the wars against the Turks which they had fought have kept alive their dream of liberating Serbia from Ottoman domination, and they

## CHAPTER FOUR

decide to emigrate to Russia, along with many others, to continue the struggle from there. Pavle is questioned at the Russian embassy in Vienna where he requests permission for himself and cousins to emigrate. Partly in order to test his loyalty, the Russians require him to undertake a series of missions to collect information on military dispositions in the Hapsburg Empire before giving him permission to enter Russia.

Looked at as a whole the novel has an episodic structure, derived from a framing device which isolates the chapters one from another. Each of the novel's 28 chapters opens with a temporal marker of one kind or another. The markers vary in the precision with which they date events. Some follow a linear pattern, while others jump in time, or indicate a broader period of time than that covered in the chapter itself. Some of the introductions are long and involve complex ways of dating events. They refer to both the Gregorian and Julian calendars, to Catholic and Orthodox church festivals, and carefully elaborate the sources of their information from archives, letters, or the words of the Isaković family themselves. Typical openings are:

Carstvujušča varoš Vijena bila je, u to doba, noću, slabo osvetljena, fenjerima - kao svećama (3).

The imperial city of Vienna was at that time weakly lit at night by lanterns - like candles.

Prema jednom pismu bolešljivog rođaka Pavlovog, lajtnanta Isaka Isakovića, u

## CHAPTER FOUR

Novom Sadu, izgleda da je Pavle bio u Temišvaru, do poslednjih dana avgusta, godine 1752 (4).

According to a letter of Pavle's sickly relative, lieutenant Isak Isaković in Novi Sad, it appears that Pavle remained in Temišvar until the last days of August, 1752.

Pomenute godine, u subotu, uoči Krstopoklone nedelje, na dan 42 mučenika u Amoreji, počeo je bio (...) parad (5).

During the aforementioned year, one Saturday, on the eve of the third Sunday after Easter, on the day of the 42 martyrs of Amurru, there had begun (...) a parade.

Each new chapter indicates a potentially new beginning, invested with a site of origin for the action to be narrated in that chapter. This episodic structure is enhanced by the pattern which emerges at the close of each chapter and so frames and separates one from the other. The ends of chapters focus on the arrival or departure of a character, usually Pavle, or the scene is described as taking place at nightfall. Each chapter finishes either by the completion of an action, arrival at or departure from a place, or is brought to a close at the natural end of the day. The end of the first example quoted above is a scene set at night (6), while the other two respectively finish thus:

Možda ga i nije više videla, ali se Pavlu učini da ga gleda razrogačenim očima i sa suzama. To je bilo poslednje što mu ostade u sećanju, iz Temišvara, kad su konji trgli, i kola pošla (7).

Perhaps she could no longer see him, but it seemed to Pavle that she was watching

## CHAPTER FOUR

him with her staring eyes filled with tears. It was the last thing which remained in his memory from Temišvar when the horses jerked and the carriage moved off.

Podne je bilo davno prošlo i Sunce je počelo da silazi na ravan Dnjepra (8).

Midday had long since passed and the Sun began to set on the surface of the Dnieper.

Some critics have considered the episodic structure of the novel to be a sign of poor construction (9).

However, the temporal markers at the beginnings of chapters indicate the presence of different narrating voices, and are part of the novel's overall design.

The chronicle voice opens each of the six chapters which relate Pavle's journeys around the Habsburg Empire on behalf of the Russian embassy. The voice charts the linear progression of time. By beginning each chapter in the sequence at the point where the previous one finished, it specifies Pavle's movements on his travels. The chapters open in the following ways: Chapter Eleven - Pavle to go to Srem on 11 August; Chapter Twelve - Pavle is returning to Temišvar towards the end of August 1752; Chapter Thirteen - Pavle remains in Temišvar to the end of August; Chapter Fourteen - Pavle sets off to Osek on 1 September; Chapter Fifteen - Pavle arrives in Graz from Osek on 10 September; Chapter Sixteen - Pavle returns to Vienna to receive a passport for Russia in autumn 1752. Each part of Pavle's journey is introduced in a way which is characteristic of the

## CHAPTER FOUR

chronicle. The events have no necessary causal sequence beyond their strict adhesion to succession in time. The chronicle voice is separated from the events by a temporal gap which is indeterminate, but fixed at some time in the future.

In the chronicle time is represented as a natural matrix in which the succession of events requires no explanation. Their order coincides with the real order in which the events took place. However, the apparent neutrality of this type of temporal organisation has been questioned by Ricoeur in his book Time and Narrative. A series of events which are placed in a relationship which simply states that one event happened, and then another "suggests that the phases of action are in external relation" and that such episodes "constitute an open series of events" (10). To say that "the phases of action are in external relation" is to describe the events as they are arranged in linear sequence by the chronicle voice with no causal connection. Furthermore, as "an open series of events" the linear progression of the journey is not a neutral presentation of time, since it denies any role that Pavle might play in occasioning action, and the historical circumstances which have brought him to undertake the journey. It denies all association with the human dimension of time, the memories, fears, and hopes which determine human agency in time.

However, the temporal organisation of the journey related by the chronicle voice can be regarded as an echo of the medieval romance (11). Towards the end of the novel the comment is heard "da će se romanca Pavlova pretvoriti u romancu o njegovim sunarodnicama" ("that Pavle's romance will be transformed into a romance about his fellow-countrymen" 12). The story of Pavle's journey corresponds to the medieval romance of the errant knight in one important respect. The knight's conduct is determined by a higher principle in life, which is the goal of his journey. His journey represents a spiritual search which supplies a teleological unity to the journey in the romance. Pavle too has a higher aim. He undertakes the missions for the Russian embassy in order to receive his passport to enter Russia with his cousins and preserve Serbian national identity against hostile threats. There is little said about the nature of his tasks, and there is more detail concerning the problems placed in Pavle's way. During the novel his resolve is often questioned by those he meets on his way, such as Božić, Trandafil, Višnjevski, and Engelshofen. These events inform the progress of Pavle's journey as a spiritual struggle, with himself at the centre armed only with his moral resolve. The episodes of his journey are introduced by the chronicle voice in this section of the novel. However, Pavle's motivation modifies the purely linear



structure of events, highlighting some events as more significant than others, and anticipating an end to his trials with his arrival in Russia. Pavle's resolve to emigrate and the trials he has to face on his journeys in order to realise his aim introduce an ethical imperative. The isolated points in time charted by the chronicle voice are contrasted with Pavle's perspective which is represented by the authorial voice.

The presentation of time as a linear sequence with no regard for character perspective is modified by the authorial voice. The authorial voice in Druga knjiga seoba is characterised by its presentation of the points of view of the Isaković family. Chapter Five opens:

Po priči Isakovića sudeći, njegovi bratenci stekli su utisak, posle, da familija Božić nije onakva, kakve su bile porodice njihovih sunarodnika, koje su, ranije, poznavali (13).

Judging by what Isaković said, his cousins gained the impression, subsequently, that the Božić family was not like the other families of their fellow countrymen whom they had known earlier.

The action specified in this quotation, what Pavle says concerning the Božić family, takes place at a point later in the story than the text has reached by this stage. What Pavle says has resonances for the family from a point before 1752 when the novel opens. The authorial voice has no fixed point in time from which it narrates, since it can relate what the cousins are

## CHAPTER FOUR

saying, thinking and feeling synchronically, and from various points in the future. The temporal gap between the authorial voice and the events it narrates is characterised by an epistemological link; in other words, its authority rests on privileged access to information which the characters knew at some point.

The authorial voice, narrating from the characters' point of view, not only disrupts temporal sequence, but also interpolates into the text the human dimension of time in which memory and anticipation both reside in the present. At the beginning of the novel Pavle is put in prison for his role in the disturbances in the Serbian regiments. A general comment is made on the passage of time in the prison, such that "u tom zatvoru, apsenik bi brzo naučio kako je u mrtvačkom sanduku, a izgubio bi i pojam o vremenu" ("in the prison, the detainee would quickly learn what it is like in a coffin, and would lose even his sense of time" 14). However, Pavle retains a sense of time passing while in prison, measured by his memories of recent events, and particularly of the official from Vienna, Garsuli, who ordered his arrest. He then reflects on his marriage and his wife who died more than a year previously while giving birth prematurely. Time is not measured by external events, and no indication is given of how long he remains in silent contemplation. But, Pavle's memories are a personal history which, although they do

## CHAPTER FOUR

not explain his present position, reveal the human dimension of hopes and fears in time.

The historical voice narrates from the point in time which corresponds to the time of writing. Unlike the authorial voice, able to move over the time period occupied by the characters and light on any point in that period, or the chronicle voice which is at a fixed but unspecified point in the future, the historical voice assesses events in the novel from what it regards as "the world in which we now live":

Tih dana, svet u kom sad živimo, bio je počeo tek da se stvara. U kolonijalnim ratovima, u pobunama, u sudbonosnim događajima u Indiji, Americi, i dalekim morima, stvarao se jedan novi svet, nov i za Evropljane. Isakovići o tom nisu znali (15).

In those days the world in which we now live had just begun to be created. In colonial wars, in revolutions, in fateful events in India, America, and the far seas, a new world was being created, new for the Europeans too. The Isaković family did not know about that.

The historical voice is isolated from the world of the Isaković family who knew nothing of the Enlightenment, and the European cultural developments of the time which laid the foundations for the culture of today. Its authority is dependent on its position in time; it contrasts with the authorial voice in that the authorial voice is linked to the knowledge of the characters, whereas the historical voice is characterised by an epistemological divide which separates it from the

characters, since it narrates what they could not know. Whereas the authorial voice relies on access to the knowledge of the family, the historical voice focuses on the institutions and social forces which shaped the wider flow of historical and political events surrounding the Serbs.

The period from spring 1752 to the end of 1753 is regarded as a span of time with its own integral unity. The now of narrating is also linked to that period as part of a historical continuum. Pavle and his cousins are motivated to emigrate as a result of Habsburg policy to Europeanise the region. The policy is presented as an attempt by a centralising authority to force cultural and political conformity on all its citizens. The Serbs are to convert to Catholicism and lose their status within the empire as the defenders of the frontier. To escape the threat this poses to their sense of national identity, the Isakovič family propose to emigrate. However, after their arrival in Russia pressure is exerted on them to accept the francophile culture then emerging in Russia. The unity of the period is marked by the spread of a pan-European consciousness and culture amongst the political elite, and by the emergence of the continental empires with their opposing military machines, which threaten to suppress the national aspirations of the Serbs. There is a contrast between the personal desires of the characters and the

## CHAPTER FOUR

institutions which allow or forbid the fulfilment of those desires. The characters attempt to maintain a sense of continuity with the nation as a part of personal identity, which the historical forces of government and state are trying to change.

The historical voice is marked by its explanatory mode of discourse through which the motives of characters are related to the cultural and political institutions of the day. It seeks to authenticate information by reference to court documents, letters, and archive sources. This verification of information lends weight to its judgements. The historical voice's order of time is achronological in that it ignores the sequence of events, but it is temporal in that it focuses on duration when highlighting the unity of style and culture of the period as a whole. It regards the epoch in which the Isakovič family live as part of an already created world, since what has happened cannot be changed. In this sense the historical voice is determinist, and the family is judged according to the criteria of historical necessity. Historical necessity ignores the hopes and fears of the characters, and assumes that the characters must submit to the political and social movements which have created "the world in which we now live". The homogeneity of the period and its place in the historical process which leads to today is defined by institutional forces, to which Pavle and

## CHAPTER FOUR

his cousins are subordinated. The two time schemes of the authorial and historical voices represent different and irreconcilable world views - the desire for freedom and the will to subjugate.

The military and government representatives of the Habsburg and Russian Empires judge and determine the fate of Pavle and his cousins. Questioning Pavle at the Russian embassy in Vienna, the official Volkov presses him to explain his motives for emigrating to Russia, and is only satisfied when Pavle commits his family to the Russian military and state:

Njima je sasvim svejedno kakve će činove da im Rosija da: oni idu u Rosiju, ne za činove, ne za porcione novce, nego zato da ratuju, na strani slavom uvenčanih rosijskih trupa. Sve što bi molio, za sebe i svoje bratence, da im se ne da pehota, nego konjica.

Volkov onda opet uzviknu: "Horošo! Horošo!" (16).

It is of no matter to them what rank Russia gives them: they are going to Russia not for rank, not for money, but to wage war on the side of the Russian troops crowned with glory. All that he would ask for himself and his cousins, that they do not give them the infantry, but the cavalry.

Volkov then again exclaimed, "Good! Good!".

Volkov's enthusiasm is a response to what he assumes to be Pavle's willingness to serve and maintain Russian military power as a symbol of the historical homogeneity of the period. As with the chronicle voice, characters are placed in external relation to events which surround them. They have been drawn into a particular epoch of

## CHAPTER FOUR

European civilisation which is expressed in the demands of institutions beyond their control. What Volkov cannot accept is that Pavle's proposal to emigrate is an expression of his desire for a better future, to live as a Serb, a matter unconnected with the time scale of historical events and historical homogeneity.

There is a direct contrast in the novel between the authorial voice and the historical voice. Pavle's final journey to Russia is narrated in two parts, in two separate chapters (17). The chronicle voice is silent, and the first chapter in the sequence is narrated mostly by the historical voice. It places Pavle's journey as one of many which the Serbs have made in the hope of finding safety in Russia away from the Habsburg threat to their national identity. The journey was long and dangerous, the travellers having to face severe privations from which many of them died. The Serbs emigrated in large numbers, whole villages and communities moving together as one. However, the journey itself revealed divisions within the nation of which the Isaković family seem to be hardly aware. It was the ordinary soldiers and their families who suffered most, and they lost confidence in their leaders. The historical background and the reception they received in Russia form the context of the journeys mentioned in this first chapter. In the following chapter, the focus falls on Pavle's own journey. It is

## CHAPTER FOUR

not measured in terms of the months required to reach Russia, but in terms of Pavle's own consciousness.

Pavle himself is the measure of duration of the action, in which the successive stages melt one into the other in a manner akin to Bergsonian notions of pure duration. The authorial voice treats time as an open structure through which it can move freely and reveal time as measured by the emotional intensity felt by the characters. Thus, for Pavle his journey is a single moment, his break for freedom.

The novel has been shown to incorporate so far three narrating voices which construct different temporal schemes through which the events of the novel are narrated: the chronicler, author, and historian. Linear succession, the multiplicity of the human dimension of time, and the cohesion of a historical period considered as a single unit, are all different ways of conceiving the temporal relationships of succession and duration. At the same time they are also creative orders, ultimately expressing ideological and ethical positions as culturally informed ways of representing the relationships between past, present, and future. The relationship of characters to these time schemes, and the extent to which they are seen to act as agents of action, express a relationship between the individual and history. Thus time is transformed from a purely symbolic order, the matrix of events, into



## CHAPTER FOUR

a creative order. Each time scheme is creative in that it determines the construction of events into a cohesive sequence which presents one explanation for the motives of characters in the plot.

The epic voice in the novel expresses a particular view of the relationship between the individual and history. It differs from the historical voice in that it assumes a static picture of the past. The first chapter of the novel is the only one which is opened by the epic voice:

Bilo jednom jedno kraljevstvo, u srcu  
Evrope, koje se zvalo: Hungarija.

U tom kraljevstvu tekle su reke  
bogate ribom, a duž tih reka prostirale  
su se beskrajne, zelene ravni. Leti su  
se te ravni pretvarale u žarke pustinje,  
a zimi u ledeno more, pokriveno snegom.  
Ljudi su osluškivali, u mraku, urlik  
vukova (18).

Once upon a time there was a kingdom, in  
the heart of Europe, which was called  
Hungarija.

In the kingdom there flowed  
rivers rich in fish, and by these rivers  
stretched boundless, green plains. In  
summer the plains were transformed into  
baking wastelands, and in winter into a  
frozen sea covered with snow. The people  
listened in the dark to the howling of  
the wolves.

In this instance the epic form is mediated entirely through the use of linguistic markers which set it apart from the other voices. The opening of the novel is set in an indeterminate past in the use of the "once-upon-a-time" formula. The word "Hungarija" is unusual, where standard Serbo-Croat would require

"Madžarska", but is recognisable as a Latin root found for example in the term "austro-ugarski" (Austro-Hungarian). This results in a degree of estrangement which is echoed in the rest of the text when Crnjanski uses archaic forms. The tendency towards inverted sentence structure evokes the archetypal story-teller, or singer of epic ballads. Such narrative strategies evoke the "absolute epic distance that separates the epic world from contemporary reality" (19) described by Bakhtin as the gap between the time of the events described and the time of their narration. Bakhtin continues to insist on the "national epic past" and "national tradition" as the "subject" and "source" for the epic (20). These other two constitutive features identified by Bakhtin confirm the opening voice as epic since they correspond to the subject matter of the novel.

The epic consciousness of time as felt and expressed by Pavle and his cousins contrasts with the other voices. The family, most often through Pavle, see and think of themselves in history as indivisible from their national identity. To return to the episode of Pavle's interview at the Russian embassy, his first response when asked by Volkov why he wishes to emigrate is described thus:

Isaković se onda trže i progovori , pa poče da priča, kako su Serbi, na Kosovu, carstvo izgubili, kako je car Lazar poginuo, ali Miloš rasporio Murata i kako

su oni, Isakovići, u Austriju prešli, i kako žive sad u Sremu i temišvarskoj Generalkomandi, u Banatu, koji su Novom. Servijom nazvali (21).

Isaković then started and began to speak, and he began to tell how the Serbs lost an empire at Kosovo, how the emperor Lazar fell, but Miloš *disembowelled* Murat and how they, the Isaković family, crossed into Austria, and how they live now in Srem at the Temišvar military post, in the Banat, which they called New Serbia.

The events to which Pavle here refers are mentioned at many other points in the novel. Kosovo is the battle of 1389 at which the Serbian leader, Tsar Lazar, and the Ottoman leader, Sultan Murat, were killed. According to the epic ballads about the battle Murat was killed by the Serbian hero Miloš Obilić. The battle signalled the Ottoman victory over the Serbs, the collapse of the Serbian medieval empire, and the subsequent Ottoman domination of the Balkans. Towards the end of the seventeenth century many Serbs left their homes in the south and were led in a mass exodus by the patriarch of Peć, Arsenije III Crnojević, into Austria. This first emigration is about to be followed a generation later by a second emigration of the Serbs to escape Habsburg threats to Serbian national identity. The Isaković cousins speak of their emigration as a search for "sreća" ("happiness"), and Pavle suddenly realises that "njegova familija nikad nije bila sretna" ("his family has never been happy" 22). "Sreća" is not just a passing emotion for the Isaković family, but is the

## CHAPTER FOUR

antithesis to the fate of the Serbian nation after Kosovo, a fate which the Isaković family and particularly Pavle feel so keenly. For Pavle and his cousins what they are now experiencing is a continuation of the effect of the Serbian defeat at Kosovo, fought almost four hundred years earlier. The train of events from the battle of Kosovo to the mid-eighteenth century is the effect of a single event. Pavle does not isolate the different stages as a series of historically determined moments, linked through cause and effect with the past and impending future, but he sees them as a continuing moment of crisis.

The epic consciousness of time exercises a powerful hold over the family, and the nation. The loss of independence and power, their subsequent search for "sreća" symbolised in the journeys Pavle undertakes on behalf of the Russian embassy in Vienna, and his final journey to Russia, are transformed into an archetype redolent of the myth of fall and salvation. Since Adam and Eve were cast from the Garden of Eden, humanity has sought salvation. Like Moses leading the Israelites from Egypt, the Serbs were led from the Ottoman Empire by Crnojević. However, unlike the Israelites they do not find their promised land. The Isaković family is prepared to go to war in order to liberate their homeland from Islam, echoing the underlying militarism of the heroic cult in epic. Pavle is prepared to fight

## CHAPTER FOUR

and die for Russia, and Volkov applauds this attitude as a sign of his loyalty to Russia. However, for Pavle his willingness to sacrifice his life is an expression of his commitment to the search for salvation inherent in the national ideal. And yet, to realise salvation will mean the redundancy of the sacrificial spirit central to the Kosovo ethic. The epic framework in which time is viewed as the continuing effect of a single event spanning four centuries is transformed from a national to a personal tragedy, since to resolve the continuing crisis destroys a constituent component of the link forged by Pavle between his self and history.

This examination of the organisation of time in relation to the narrating voices of Druga knjiga seoba reveals the epic element to be one of four narrating voices. Each voice introduces into the text a time scheme in which the events of the novel are organised. The four schemes function in parallel, contrasting with one another. Time does not provide a structure uniting the events in one temporal model, nor is time neutral. The relationships of sequence and duration constructed by the voices inscribe the characters into the action of the novel, and into the historical circumstances surrounding events, in different ways. The co-existence of change and continuity noted as a feature of the language and structure of Seobe is transformed in Druga knjiga seoba into tension. The emphasis in the

## CHAPTER FOUR

second novel falls on the differences between individual and institutional concepts of time and history, and the dialectic between self and history.

### Roman o Londonu

Crnjanski's last novel, Roman o Londonu, was published in 1971 although its genesis goes back to his earlier days as an émigré in London. It contains many structural and thematic features with respect to time which echo the other novels. Voice is an important element in this novel, as in Druga knjiga seoba. The compositional design of his last novel is based on the contrast between the voice of an impersonal narrator, and the voices of the main character. These latter voices are those of the main character as narrator, and others which are presented in the text as if they were the voices of characters, although they are all in the main character's mind. They represent aspects of his hopes and fears for the future and what has happened to him in the past. They are given greater substance by his frequent recollections from his past. To a certain degree the focus on one character in this fashion resembles Crnjanski's first novel Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću. The distinction lies in the presentation of an identified main character in the last novel, the Russian émigré Prince Nikolaj Rodionovič Rjepnin.

Rjepnin is not the author of a diary, but the

## CHAPTER FOUR

tortured reflections expressed by the voices conjured up in his mind are confessional. He names them as the voice of his friend Barlov, who is often heard expressing the unpleasant truths from which Rjepnin tries to shield himself. Barlov is a friend who committed suicide while in emigration. Then there are the voices of Jim and John, as Rjepnin names them. They suggest different ways in which the prince is to consider his past, future, and present position, and different ways for him to consider his living in time. As they organise and privilege certain memories, certain experiences, and hopes they give evidence of value systems, all of which emanate from the prince and confront him with the choice between life and death. In all Crnjanski's novels the presence of the characters as narrators, or as agents from whose point of view events are narrated, is a central feature of the presentation of time. In Roman o Londonu Rjepnin's position in the text as a narrator of his own fate links time, character, action, and values.

Roman o Londonu is narrated in the third person. However, as evidence from our analysis of Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću suggests, Crnjanski's use of the first and third person pronouns is not a necessary distinction between characters and narrators. There are a number of linguistic and textual markers which indicate that for large parts of the novel Rjepnin is himself the

## CHAPTER FOUR

narrator. The novel opens in a carriage of the London underground, with an unidentified "I" who is the narrator, and who remarks, "Egalité, fraternité - čujem kako neko više, nemo, u jednom vagonu podzemne železnice, u Londonu" ("Egalité, fraternité - I hear someone shout silently in a carriage of the underground railway, in London" 23). The narrator has revealed himself as omniscient, able to report what the as yet unidentified "he" is thinking and feeling. However, as the first chapter progresses, the relationship between the "I" and "he" changes. The narrator loses his omniscience and is presented as if a fellow-passenger or friend of the "he", who is named as Prince Nikolaj Rodionovič Rjepnin. Instead of overhearing the inner scream of the prince he listens to him like a friend or confidant: "kad mi je to rekao" ("when he told me that" 24); "šapuće mi taj Rus, u podzemnoj železnici" ("the Russian whispered to me in the underground railway" 25); "priča mi taj čovek" ("the man tells me" 26); and even asks him a question, "Pitam ga, što ne ode u američku vojsku" ("I ask him, why doesn't he go and join the American army" 27).

The prince is distraught at his émigré status, living anonymously in a huge alien city, so the "I" of the passage comforts him:

Tešim ga i time da mi susedi pričaju da ovakvih zima ima samo svakih deset godina u Londonu. Proći će. Najgore je već prošlo (28).



I comfort him with what my neighbours tell me that there are only winters like this every ten years in London. It will pass. The worst has already passed.

The comfort which the narrator affords the prince is repeated in these few pages with the comment "ja ga tešim" ("I comfort him" 29). On arrival at the last station the crowds who leave the underground wish each other goodnight:

Ljudi, na kraju, žele jedno drugom dobro. Žele jedno drugome, na krajnjoj stanici dobro. Nešto utešno.

Ta krajnja stanica, do koje sam, nevidljiv, dopratio tu ljudsku senku u ofucanom šinjelu, zvala se: Mill Hill (30).

People, finally, wish each other well. They wish each other well at the last station. Something comforting.

The last station to which I have, unseen, accompanied the human shadow in his threadbare army greatcoat is called Mill Hill.

No-one wishes the prince good night. He is alone with his invisible companion, who accompanies him home. They speak to one another in a conversation which cannot be heard:

U takvom, nečujnom, razgovoru, bili smo u tom ćorsokaku stigli, do jednog kućerka, zavejanog, koji se, između dva hrasta, beleo. Kao avet se beleo (31).

In that unheard conversation we had arrived in the cul-de-sac, before a delapidated house, snow-covered, which shone white between two oaks. It shone white like a spectre.

The narrator is invisible and ~~inaudible to~~ others. He acts as if omniscient, and also acts like a friend in a

## CHAPTER FOUR

world where the prince is alone. He seems to have attributes of both a narrator and a character.

Later, some of the actions and words of this character-narrator are echoed. Rjepnin has a recurring dream about his friend Barlov, when they were young men together in St Petersburg. He tells his wife, Nada, of his dream:

Rjepnin, skoro svake noći, hoda po Nevskom prospektu i priča joj, tužno, ujutru, o tome. Stoji na ulici i prašta se od onih, sa kojima je proveo veče. Barlov ga, do kuće, prati (32).

Rjepnin, almost every night, walks along Nevsky Prospekt and he tells her about it sadly, in the morning. He stands on the street and takes his leave from those with whom he has spent the evening. Barlov accompanies him to his house.

The reference which the narrator makes to his neighbours' comments on the weather is echoed in the very formal and distanced relationship which the Rjepnins share with their neighbours, Mr Green and Mr Christmas. The winter as an expression of the prince's mood and general outlook at that moment implies a reflection on the part of the prince on his present isolation. Later, the prince relates how one of the voices within him, John, is a source of comfort. It is this inner voice which presents him with an alternative to his pessimistic view of the fate of the émigré as something of which he can be proud, since Russian émigrés "su naučili svet baletu, pevanju" ("have taught the world ballet, singing" 33). It is even stated at

## CHAPTER FOUR

one point that "John ga je sad težio" ("John now comforted him" 34). Barlov, Rjepnin and John are all associated with this invisible companion on the underground.

It is only in the opening few pages that the narrator is represented by the first person singular. The attributes which distinguish him from the prince, insofar as he offers him comfort and walks him home, are later seen as part of the prince's consciousness. The "I" and the "he" in the opening pages are both references to the prince. The prince is a covert first-person narrator. The division of his personality is a function of his distress at the poverty and anonymity of his émigré status, expressed on the narrative level. The "I" is presented as the narrator and the "he" as the object of narration. But both subject and object are parts of the same personality, now fragmented, a feature which comes to dominate the novel.

This type of narrative, from the prince's consciousness, contrasts with those passages dominated by the impersonal narrator who often sets the scene for the action to follow:

Posle te duge zime, tako retke, i neobične, u Londonu, - proleće je bilo, u London, ipak stiglo, kao da ga je sunce na more probudilo. Korak po korak, duž reke Temze, proleće je ulazilo u Englesku, - a u parkovima Londona pojavile se krokusi (35).

## CHAPTER FOUR

After the long winter, so rare and unusual in London, spring had nevertheless arrive in London, as if woken by the sun on the sea. Step by step, spring entered England along the river Thames, and crocuses appeared in the London parks.

In this quotation the impersonal narrator has even adopted the bird's eye view similar to the position afforded on occasion by the observer-narrator in Seobe. The narrator has access to everything which the prince could know, and at times narrates retrospectively, looking at the past through the prince's eyes, and telling things which only he could know:

To što je taj ruski emigrant, to veče, svojoj ženi ispričao, nije bilo, sve. On je bio zaista otišao u Ministarstvo rada - majoru Gardneru - koji je razoružanim Poljacima nalazio zaposlenja. On je, zaista, tražio, tamo, rada, - i manuelnog, ma kakvog rada, - ali nije ispričao kako se to sve svršilo (36).

What that Russian émigré told his wife that evening had not been everything. He had really set off to the Ministry of Employment to see Major Gardner, who found employment for the demobbed Poles. He really did look for work there, even manual or any sort of work, but he did not tell how it had all ended.

This omniscient narrator has access to the thoughts and actions of all the characters, including Rjepnin's wife, but the balance of the text is narrated either by Rjepnin or from his point of view. The narrator refers to Rjepnin as "junak našeg romana" ("the hero of our novel" 37). This phrase reinforces the impression of an

## CHAPTER FOUR

impersonal and distanced narrator. The presence of such a narrator prompted the following comment from Milan

Pražić:

U prvim poglavljima svoje knjige Roman o Londonu Miloš Crnjanski drži jasnu distancu prema glavnom junaku ove obimne priče. To čudno i nesnalažljivo lice, knjaz Nikolaj Rodionovič Rjepnin, kao da nije u punoj milosti pisca (38).

In the first chapters of his book Roman o Londonu Miloš Crnjanski maintains a clear distance from the main character of this immense story. The strange and inadequate character, Prince Nikolaj Rodionovič Rjepnin, as if he is not in the writer's favour.

Pražić's remark is based on the position of the impersonal narrator in the opening chapters of the novel, and as such is not quite accurate when the whole novel is taken into account. The distinction between the "I" and the "he" of the first chapter has already been questioned in this thesis. Following this chapter, in the first part of the novel, there is an impersonal narrator present. But, the novel is divided into three parts. The first part is set in London, when the prince and Nada are facing the lowest ebb in their fortunes. Rjepnin has come to the conclusion that the only solution is suicide (39). However, he gets a job and their situation improves. The second part of the novel is set in Cornwall where Rjepnin goes on holiday, paid for by a benefactress, a Polish countess. He stays in a hotel used by Russian and Polish émigrés, where he gets to know his fellow guests. He keeps in contact with

them after his return to London, even having an affair with one. In the third part, following his return to London, he loses his job, has difficulties with his new friends, and persuades his wife to go to America where she has an aunt who is willing to help. They plan that Nada will prepare the way for him to join her later, and that they will begin a new life together. In his isolation the prince decides not to join Nada, and carefully lays plans to take his own life. He commits suicide on the last page of the novel.

The impersonal narrator in the first part of the novel contrasts with the voices of Rjepnin. However, in the second part the impersonal narrator dominates. It is this narrator who "maintains a clear distance from the prince", as Pražić comments. He describes the scenes of action. When narrating from the point of view of the prince, he maintains a position which is external to the prince. In Cornwall, the prince is at his most relaxed, his economic pressures have eased, and there are few instances in which the prince questions his past and present. In the third part of the novel the impersonal narrator is gradually effaced until the text is dominated by the prince himself. The voices associated with the prince reveal his hopes and fears more immediately, reflecting his growing psychological disturbance. The distinction between the impersonal narrator and the prince's own voices can be recognised

in the language of the text.

The presence of the prince as narrator is signalled throughout the text by linguistic markers. In Seobe the direct speech of Vuk Isaković is given in slaveno-serbski; in Roman o Londonu there are numerous instances in which foreign languages are included to indicate the prince's voice. The prince is a Russian émigré, living in London, and the hero of a novel published in Serbo-Croat. As such, the instances in which Russian is used can safely be assumed to indicate the prince's voice. There are also numerous phrases in Serbo-Croat which are borrowings from English idioms: the Rjepnins will end up "u oluku" ("in the gutter") and that happiness is just "iza ćoška" ("around the corner") which are not idiomatic in Serbo-Croat. Such phrases express the linguistic confusion of the émigré who has lived many years outside his native environment, reflecting "the fate of an exile in linguistic terms" (40). On other occasions English words are misspelt. The Hotel Savoy appears in two forms on the same page, as "Sawoy" and "Sevoy" (41). Replacing the "w" for the "v" in the first example is the reverse of the typical difficulty many Russians have in pronouncing English "w", often using a "v" sound. The second example is a transliteration of what a Russian would hear in the English "a" of Savoy. The total effect is to give the impression of a non-native speaker using a language in a

country where he has lived for some time.

These isolated words are complemented by longer phrases. One day Rjepnin is sitting in the park when he notices a youth close by and is startled when the boy asks him the time:

Pošto se u tom parku Svetog Jakova, čuje sat sa tornja Parlamenta, junak našeg romana pomisli: Što me pita? Zatim odgovara, "Na mom je satu prošlo pola dva." "It's half past one by my watch." Dečko mu učtivo kaže: hvala.

Tek da nešto doda, junak našeg romana, dodaje, "Možda vam se žuri?" "Are you in a hurry?" (42).

Since the clock on the tower of the Parliament building can be clearly heard from Saint James' park, the hero of our novel thinks: Why is he asking me? Then he answers, "It's turned half past one by my watch." "It's half past one by my watch." The youth politely says to him thanks.

Just to add something the hero of our novel adds, "Seems you're in a hurry?" "Are you in a hurry?"

The prince first wonders why the boy is asking when he can hear the clock chiming. Then the reply in Serbo-Croat is given idiomatically as a little after half-past one, but the phrase in English says precisely "half-past one", as if spoken by someone who to himself uses an idiomatic phrase which is more easily rendered into the foreign language by rounding the figures to the nearest division. A similar effect is given in the second paragraph. The question "Možda vam se žuri?" is delivered with some hesitation and indirectness. The inclusion of "možda" indicates a stranger asking a



question which might be taken as too direct. However, the question as phrased in English contains no such subtlety. The English phrases are as spoken by Rjepnin, and the Serbo-Croat phrases indicate what is in his mind at the time, but which he cannot render precisely into English.

In this short passage the verbs are given in the present tense. The passage preceeding it describes the scene in the park and is dominated by the perfect tense of the impersonal narrator relating the events retrospectively, and opens, "To se dogodilo jednog petka" ("It happened one Friday" 43). The shift from perfect to present tense is a shift from the diachronic narration of the impersonal observer to the synchronic narration of the character. The use of the present tense in this way in Serbo-Croat is used to convey a greater immediacy of action. However, in Roman o Londonu, the present tense is part of the novel's compositional design. The perfect tense indicates the voice of the impersonal narrator, and the present tense indicates the voice of Rjepnin. This particular use of verbs has been described by Uspensky, when the present tense is associated with

a series of scenes, each being presented from a synchronic point of view and within which time seems to stop. Verbs in the past tense, however, describe the shifts that take place between the scenes, forming the context against which the synchronic scenes must be perceived (44).

Rjepnin's own narration of the scene is reinforced by the change of tense and the linguistic transgressions. To compare with the second part of the novel, there is hardly any synchronic narration in the episode when Rjepnin goes on holiday to Cornwall. Most of the verbs are in the past tense. The narrator takes on the task of retrospective narration. On his return from Cornwall when tensions again build up, there is a more frequent use of synchronic narration, and an emphasis on the prince's mental torment.

There are occasions on which speech marks are omitted from the text although the tense structures and the persons of the verb indicate direct dialogue between the prince and his wife. Their speech is not always marked as distinct from the descriptive scenes of the text, equating their voices with the narrator's. Such instances are more frequent in the last part of the novel. In the final pages the prince visits the American Embassy to ask that his wife be allowed to stay with her aunt. In this scene a first person pronoun is introduced:

On misli (I think) da, od zemlje  
 prezidenta Linkolna, ne bi bilo lepo, da  
 jednu ženu, proteraju, samo zato, što ima  
 intriga, raznih emigranata, i  
 emigrantskih komiteta, koji niču, sad,  
 kao pećurke, i sa jedne, i sa druge,  
 strane okeana (45).

He thinks (I think) that it would not  
 be agreeable for the country of President  
 Lincoln to expel a woman, just

because of the intrigues hatched by various émigrés, and émigré committees, which are now springing up like mushrooms on both sides of the ocean.

The repetition of the first verb in English and with a first person pronoun reinforces the presence of the prince and his voice, narrating immediately as if without the mediation of another.

Slavko Leovac comments on the division of language in the novel:

U Romanu o Londonu postoje, čini nam se, dva osnovna načina uobličavanja građe između kojih se odvija neka vrsta takmičenja: jedan je putopisno-esejistički i čas kalačko-pričalački s povremenim malim poetskim akcentima; drugi je pripovedni, romaneskno prikazivački s povremenim dramskim akcentima (46).

It seems to us that there are two basic methods of shaping the structure in Roman o Londonu, between which a sort of competition unfolds: one is the travelogue-essay and chatty-conversational type with occasional slight poetic flourishes; the other is narrative, a novelistic reviewing type with occasional dramatic flourishes.

This analysis agrees with the types of distinctions to which Leovac points. However, this analysis emphasises the "dramatic flourishes" as those passages in which the immediacy of the narrative is greatest, and partly shown by the "chatty" features which are imparted in the syntactic fragmentation of his sentences, common to all his novels, which suggest patterns of speech and oral delivery rather than written prose. The voices of the

prince are an important element in the temporal organisation of the narrative in Roman o Londonu. Furthermore, the contrast between retrospective and immediate narration, is integral to the novel on the thematic level. The novel traces the psychological problem facing the prince as one which concerns his identity, and his being in time. The past, present, and future are parts of his self which appear to him to be fragmented. This is reflected in the use of a third person pronoun when the prince's voice dominates the text.

The disintegration of Rjepnin's personality which was first examined in relation to the use of the personal pronouns "I" and "he" in the first chapter of Roman o Londonu again becomes an issue in the last. The issue centres on who is narrating, who is "I" and who is "he". After Nada's departure to the United States, Rjepnin loses his job, which had guaranteed him accommodation. By chance he meets a friend from his days as an army officer in St Petersburg, Ordinski. Ordinski offers him the use of his flat, and it is there that Rjepnin comes to the decision to take his own life. In the mental turmoil which precedes the decision he again hears voices in his head, in Russian, but can no longer distinguish their origin, "Sryednyy klass, sryednyy klass, ta lyedi - mrmljao mu je Barlov, ili John, ili Jim, u uši" ("Middle class, middle

## CHAPTER FOUR

class, that lady - murmured Barlov, or John, or Jim, in his ears" 47). The source of the other voice is now unclear. Rjepnin begins to write letters to Ordinski, which he destroys. They are recreations of conversations they had in their youth, when they would often argue about the merits of Napoleon. Ordinski recognised him as a great military leader, while Rjepnin saw him as the conqueror of Moscow.

The prince has an obsessive fixation on the figure of Napoleon which runs as a motif through the book. His fixation is a faint echo of Raskolnikov's attitude towards Napoleon in Crime and Punishment, the prince having a patronymic derived from Dostoevsky's character's Christian name. Napoleon, much though he is to be hated for what he did in Russia, possesses the will which Rjepnin acknowledges as lacking in himself. His letters to Ordinski are not reminiscences of the past but recreations of their debates which reverberate in the prince's present turmoil. He writes as if he were rehearsing the problems which confront him through the figure of Napoleon. On one occasion he refers to what Napoleon has written in his memoirs, with the comment that "Napoleon kaže - on govori o sebi u trećem licu kao Cezar" ("Napoleon says - he speaks about himself in the third person like Caesar" 48). Following Napoleon's practice, when using the third person the prince is referring to himself.

In the first chapter the prince sees himself as a divided subject, not only on the level of narrative presentation, but in a more literal sense, in the window of a passing tube train:

Ma kako jurile ljudske misli, u prošlost, u mozgu, - čak i u jednom takvom, raseljenom, mozgu, - vozovi podzemne železnice u Londonu neće da, zbog toga, stanu. Naprotiv, jure pod zemljom, i paralelno. Tada svaki u vagonu, vidi, za trenut, dva, svoje lice, sebe, i u drugom vozu, kao u nekom podzemnom ogledalu, i nestaje brzo (49).

However human thoughts rush into the past, in the mind - even in such a displaced mind - the trains of the underground railway in London will not, for that reason, stop. On the contrary, they race under the ground even in parallel. Then, each one in the carriage can see for a moment or two his own face, himself, in the other train as if in some underground mirror, and quickly disappears.

This image of the duality of being is expressed later in the novel by the voices of Jim and John. In the third part of the novel, Rjepnin is invited to the house of Sir Malcolm Parks, who had been one of the guests at the hotel in Cornwall. He tries to explain to Parks that he feels as if he is inhabited by two different beings:

Pokušao je da objasni, da se, u njemu, ruskom emigrantu u Londonu, bore dva bića, - koje on, u šali, u sebi, naziva: Jim i John. Džim mu viče u uvo da je bednik, prosjak u tuđini, da će da završi u oluku. Da samo u svojoj zemlji može čovek da bude srećan. Da je, to, što je zadesilo Ruse najveća nesreća, gora nego što je bilo najezda Mongola i mongolsko ropstvo. Na celom svetu ruski oficiri ima da peru sudove, prodaju novine, čiste ulice, prodaju čilimove, ili zelen.

Džoni mu više u uvo da, ni malo, ne treba da se stidi, što je ruski emigrant. Ruski emigranti su naučili svet baletu, pevanju, u Parizu, u Americi, u teatru. Čak i Šekspiru. A siromašni, stari, kosmati, ruski profesori, napuniše u tuđini, knjigama, katedre i universitete, kao nekad Grci, kad je Konstantinopolj pao. Džon kaže da treba da se oseća, kao apostol, ali, na žalost, on je oficir, oficir, potomak Rjepnina, koji je sa svojim kozacima ušao u Pariz. Eto to je. Džim mu viču u uši da treba da se stidi, jer će njihova deca da služe tuđinu. Menjaju i svoje ime. Ne znaju više, ni svoj jezik. Postaju Francuzi, Amerikanci, Englezi, Nemci, Italijani, melezi. Prodaju se, kao što su robove prodavali. Postali su đubre za nadubrivanje, neplodnih zemalja. Pa šta je onda istina: Jim ili John? Je li to bila sreća, ili nesreća? (50).

He tried to explain that in him, the Russian émigré in London, two beings fought - which he named as a joke to himself: Jim and John. Jim cries in his ear that he is poor, a beggar in a foreign country, that he will finish up in the gutter. That a man can only be happy in his own country. That what has happened to the Russians is the greatest misfortune, worse than the invasion of the Mongols and Mongolian slavery. In the whole world Russian officers have to wash dishes, sell newspapers, clean streets, sell rugs, or vegetables. Johnny cries in his ear that he should not feel ashamed in the least because he is a Russian émigré. Russian émigrés have taught the world ballet, singing, in Paris, in America, in the theatre. Even taught Shakespeare. And poor, old, long-haired Russian professors have been filling chairs and universities abroad with their books, like the Greeks once did when Constantinople fell. John says that he should feel like an apostle, but he, unfortunately, is an officer, officer, descendant of the Rjepnin who entered Paris with his Cossacks. There it is. Jim cries in his ears that he should be ashamed, for their children will serve a foreign country. They are

changing their names. They no longer know even their own language. They are becoming Frenchmen, Americans, Englishmen, Germans, Italians, half-breeds. They are selling themselves, as slaves used to be sold. They have become manure for the fertilisation of barren lands. Well what is the truth then: Jim or John? Was it happiness, or unhappiness?

The two voices which he hears represent two different ways for the prince to view his life. One is optimistic and the other is pessimistic. On the one hand, his nation has contributed a great deal to the history of civilisation. On the other hand, there appears to be no future for them. Their children are turning their backs on the national heritage. The dilemma for Rjepnin is to come to terms with his present position in this historical process of which he is, by dint of family and nationality, a part. Like Pavle in Druga knjiga seoba, Rjepnin verbalises the problem as a search for "sreća" ("happiness").

Barlov confronts the prince with the same issue, speaking in Russian:

Čuo je, međutim, kako mu se, u sećanju, njegov pokojni drug, Barlov, smeje, u glavi: Kakaya nyeobyknovyennaya metamorfoza, knyaz'! Kakaya nyeobyknovyennaya metamorfoza! Vy stalinist, knyaz'? Vy stalinist? (51).

He heard, however, in his memory, his late friend Barlov in his head laughing at him, "What an unusual metamorphosis, prince! What an unusual metamorphosis! Are you a Stalinist, prince? Are you a Stalinist?"

The transformations to which Barlov is referring are



## CHAPTER FOUR

those which Rjepnin has experienced from being the son of a member of the pre-revolutionary Duma, an army officer in the imperial Russian army, wealthy and privileged, to his humble conditions as an émigré. Metamorphosis is a natural process in the biological world, but not for Rjepnin. The issue for Rjepnin concerns the control and will he has been able to exercise over the changes in his life. The metamorphosis is not just unusual but beyond his comprehension, as if he has been the victim of events. Rjepnin considers this as a lack of will, for which Napoleon provides him with a counter model as he reflects, "Taj, trbušasti Korzikanac, zamislio je i metamorfoz Francuske, i revolucije, u monarhiju, kao dete" ("That tubby Corsican planned the metamorphosis of France, and the revolution into a monarchy, while still a child" 52).

The two passages above, and elsewhere when the prince reflects on his life, reveal Rjepnin's problem as one of identity in time. He attempts to understand who he is, but cannot understand that present state of being in relation to his past, and in relation to what might be in the future. Hannah Arendt, in her book Between Past and Future, has described the status of the subject in the present in a way which corresponds to the issue facing Rjepnin:

Seen from the viewpoint of man, who  
always lives in the internal between past

and future, time is not a continuum, a flow of uninterrupted succession; it is broken in the middle, at the point where "he" stands; and "his" standpoint is not the present as we usually understand it but rather a gap in time which "his" constant fighting, "his" making a stand against past and future, keeps in existence (53).

Rjepnin is trying to maintain a sense of who he has been, who he is now, and what he can expect to be in the future. However, as he approaches the time of his suicide, the different times of his life become more confused in his mind, and the "gap in time" which is the present encompasses his whole life, which then seems to be undifferentiated and empty.

The orchestration of voices in Roman o Londonu is a compositional design which highlights the issues of identity and being in time faced by Rjepnin. He is confronted by the transience of experience in which he finds no comfort for his present position. He reflects on his inability to control the transformations which his life has taken. He distinguishes various ways of viewing the past, present, and future, and embodies them in the names of Barlov, Jim, John, and Napoleon. Ultimately, he is none of these. With no established sense of self, he is left to comment on his predicament in the third person, as if he were discussing someone else. In the final pages of the novel he remarks "On je lud. Taj Rus" ("He is mad. That Russian" 54). The remark is delivered in the third person. However, this

analysis has shown that there are instances where the third person narration is conducted by the prince himself. Rjepnin refers to himself as if he were the witness and not the victim of events. This type of narration reveals the prince to be distanced from his self, and from the changes which time has brought.

As a general conclusion to Part Two, this analysis of Crnjanski's novels has shown him to be a writer who dislocates the sequence of events from any necessary causal connection. His characters act as creators of temporal schemes, interacting with other impersonal narrators. Such a presentation of time in his novels is embedded in the type of language and narrative structures which he uses. This is characteristic of his sumatraist style. His use of fragmented sentence structures and syntax is designed to enhance particular experiences of time. In his final two novels, Crnjanski continues to use language in a similar way, but it is in his arrangement of voice that they find compositional coherency. The different voices narrate events with different orders of duration and succession, and are placed in different temporal relationships to the events being described. In all, the characters play an active part in the construction of time schemes in Crnjanski's novels. Time is revealed through their contrasting perspectives on the sequence and duration of events.

In his two early essays, "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'"

and "Za slobodni stih", Crnjanski emphasises the expressive power of language, and of literary form. His novels reflect the association between form and ideas. This connection is reflected in his coining of the term sumatraism which is both a literary reference to the first line of Pandurović's poem "Svetkovina" ("Sišli smo s uma u sjajan dan"), and to a way of thinking and perceiving which is intuitive and irrational. Through his manipulation of time Crnjanski creates the effects of particular literary genres in his novels. Rjepnin's function as a narrator in Roman o Londonu gives the impression that this is "priča koju osluškujemo" ("a story which we overhear" 55). The synchronic narration by characters and from character points of view in the earlier novels is here transformed into dramatic immediacy. This impression is reinforced by the stage motif in the opening paragraph of the novel:

Svi se pisci romana slažu, uglavnom, kad je reč o svetu u kom živimo. To je, kažu, neka vrsta velike, čudnovate, pozornice, na kojoj svaki, neko vreme, igra svoju ulogu. A zatim silazi sa scene, da se na njoj više ne pojavi. Nikada, - nikogda. Niti zna zašto je u tom teatru igrao, niti zašto je baš tu ulogu imao, niti ko mu je tu ulogu dodelio, a ni gledaoci ne znaju, posle, kuda je iz tog teatra otišao. (Uyekhal - više neko u jednom vagonu podzemne železnice u Londonu). Pisci kažu i to, da smo, samo pri tom silasku sa pozornice, svi, jednaki. I kraljevi, i prosjaci (56).

All writers of the novel agree, on the whole, when the world in which we live is under discussion. It is, they say, a

sort of large, strange, stage on which each one plays his role for a time. And then he exits from the scene, to appear on it no more. Never, - never. Nor does he know why he has played in that particular theatre, nor why he had that particular role, nor who gave him the role, and the spectators do not know, after, where he has gone from the theatre. (He has gone - someone shouts in a carriage of the underground railway in London). Writers say even that we are, only on exit from the stage, all equal. Both kings and beggars.

Rjepnin is an actor whose internal drama is portrayed, and, as with Shakespeare's metaphor "All the world's a stage", the drama concerns the ages through which men pass in life and in time (57). The reflections of the actor-character are communicated with the illusion of direct mediation, as if on the stage. The stage motif is continued in the novel as Rjepnin gives a description of the stranger features of the gender transposition in the English pantomime (58), and is taken back to his days in St Petersburg while watching a performance on ice of Swan Lake (59).

The very title of Crnjanski's last novel, Roman o Londonu (A Novel about London), reflects his deliberate use of generic terms. It is a description of its contents, as is the title of the novel's first chapter:

Prvo poglavlje Romana o Londonu ima neuobičajen naslov: "Prva glava romana". To poglavlje ima i poseban status u čitavom delu (60).

The first chapter of Roman o Londonu has an unusual title: "The First Chapter

of the Novel". The chapter also has a specific status in the whole work.

The specific status of the first chapter examined here is its suggestion of Rjepnin as a narrating voice. The beginning of the story is also specified in this chapter when the narrator remarks, "Međutim, sa tim čovekom počinje, u idućem poglavlju, ova priča" ("However, with that man the story begins in the next chapter" 61). The story will not only be about the prince, his wife, the emigre community, but also about the people of London, and particularly "o toj, ogromnoj, varoši, čiji je zagrljaj bio smrtonosan za toliko ljudi i žena" ("about that huge town whose embrace was fatal for so many men and women" 62).

Language and literary form are the writer's raw materials for the organisation of his work. In this first chapter Crnjanski distinguishes the story, the events as they happened, from the text, the order in which they are narrated in the novel. The story begins in Chapter Two of the novel, and not in Chapter One. This distinction corresponds to the structuralist view of time in the narrative structure of novels, as outlined by Todorov:

There exists a "problem of time" because two temporalities are found juxtaposed: that of the universe represented and that of the discourse representing it. This difference between the order of events and the order of words is an obvious one, but literary theory took it fully into account only when the Russian Formalists employed it as one of the chief indices

in order to set the fable (order of events) in opposition to the subject (order of discourse) (63).

However, the temporal organisation of Roman o Londonu and Crnjanski's other novels is based on the temporal position of the narrator in relation to the events being narrated. There are a number of points of view on the temporal plane which contrast with and complement one another. The central distinction is the difference between the time of narration, and the time at which the event took place. It is what Genette has termed the actual narration's "positive relation to the story" (64). In Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću the temporal scheme alternates between the now of narration and the now of memory. The characters and impersonal narrators of Seobe, Druga knjiga seoba and Roman o Londonu all interact in their different relationships to the time of the events, and with different degrees of synchronic and diachronic, immediate and retrospective narration.

In his first poems Crnjanski disrupts the expectations aroused by traditional literary terms. Zdenko Lešić comments on such terms as found in the titles of Crnjanski's poetry:

The titles of these poems often contain the names of some traditional poetic form of the so-called sublime style of classical rhetoric: hymn, ode, elegy, dithyramb, homage. He distorts them to show their inner and reverse meaning (65).

In his study Lešić analyses Crnjanski's designation of

his poems by traditional forms on the one hand, and his expression of opposite sentiments on the other hand. In his novels, Crnjanski continues to distort the expectations aroused by genres and literary forms. His first novel is called a diary about someone other than the diarist. Milan Bogdanović comments on Seobe:

Pojam seobe, kojim je kršten roman Miloša Crnjanskog, upućuje čitaoca u očekivanju događaja. Međutim, sam roman ne razvija zbivanja, već daje jedno stanje (66).

The notion of emigration, with which Miloš Crnjanski's novel is christened, encourages the reader to expect events. However, the novel itself does not develop events, rather it offers a state.

Druga knjiga seoba suggests biblical echoes in its designation as the "second book", while the epic genre of the opening pages is one of many narrating voices, some of which counter the expectations of the epic. The title of Roman o Londonu states that it is a novel, while it contains the dramatic narrating voice of the main character. In his long essay "Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel", Bakhtin remarks that time is the primary category which "defines genre and generic distinctions" (67). In Crnjanski's novels the distortion of genres is a consequence of their complex temporal organisation, established largely by the characters themselves. The participation of characters in the creation of time schemes in his novels leads us to a second remark by Bakhtin, that in literature the



## CHAPTER FOUR

expression of time is "always coloured by emotions and values" (68). Crnjanski's focus on the multiple time schemes introduced by characters reveals time to be an order for experience which is determined by the values and psychological states of his characters. Time is an active and creative ingredient by which the characters consider their relationship to self and to history.

Notes

1. Novica Petković, Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 1985, p39.

Many critics incorporate mention of Crnjanski's highly individual and specific use of language and syntax into their comments. The following references are to studies about his use of language.

For reference to all Crnjanski's novels see Radoje Simić, "Gramatička i intonacijska struktura proznog dela Miloša Crnjanskog", Književna istorija, 1978, XI, 41, pp15-60.

For reference to Crnjanski's use of punctuation see Jasmina Lovrić, "Funkcija interpunkcija u Crnjanskoj prozi", Delo, 1978, XXIV, 5, pp67-72.

For reference to Seobe see Berislav Nikolić, "Jezik u Seobama Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp235-245.

Also see Pavle Zorić, "Struktura poetske proze Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, pp209-234. Zorić focuses on Seobe and discusses more general features of language and narrative.

For reference to Roman o Londonu see Milorad Radovanović, "Neki sintaksički postupci karakteristični za jezik knjige Roman o Londonu Miloša Crnjanskog", Prilozi proučavanja jezika, 1974, 10, pp1-48.

Milorad Radovanović, "Značenja i funkcije pluskamperfekta u Romanu o Londonu Miloša Crnjanskog", Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu, 1975, XVIII, 1, pp165-179.

Dragoljub Zbiljić, "Neka odstupanja od jezičke norme u Romanu o Londonu M. Crnjanskog", Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini, 1978, XIII, pp457-466.

2. Radovan Vučković, "Osnovne crte simbolike i strukture romana Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Književne analize, Zavod za izdavanja udžbenika, Sarajevo, 1972, p122.

Pavle Zorić, "Struktura poetske proze Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, p226.

Slavko Leovac, Romansijer Miloš Crnjanski, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1981, pp85-122.

These critics have made specific reference to the epic features in Druga knjiga seoba, and also point to other features of the novel which are not epic.

An earlier version of this section on Druga knjiga

## CHAPTER FOUR

seoba, "Epic and Time in Miloš Crnjanski's Novel Druga knjiga seoba", appeared in The Slavonic and East European Review, 1988, 66, 2, pp224-235.

3. IV, p222.

4. IV, p394.

5. V, p280.

6. IV, p259.

7. IV, p413.

8. V, p305.

9. Tomislav Ladan, "Od historije do poezije i natrag. Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe I i II, izd. SKZ, Beograd, 1962", U škarama, Znanje, Zagreb, 1965, p97.

Muharem Pervić, "Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Treći program, 1977, 33, p270.

10. Paul Ricoeur: Time and Narrative, vol 1, University of Chicago Press, 1984, p67.

11. Velimir Visković: 'Seobe i njihovo mjesto u stvaralaštvu Miloša Crnjanskog', Književna istorija, 1973, V, 20, pp606-631.

Visković discusses Druga knjiga seoba with reference to the romance tradition, and particularly with reference to the journey motif in the picaresque tradition. We have discounted the picaresque because Crnjanski's novel differs in two important respects; firstly the hero Pavle is not from the lower social orders, secondly his journey is not aimless wandering, whereas these are characteristic features of the picaresque.

12. V, p469.

13. IV, p132.

14. IV, p45.

15. IV, p260.

16. IV, p268.

17. V, Chapter 3, p141, Chapter 4, p169.

18. IV, p5.

19. Mikhail Bakhtin, "Epic and Novel", The Dialogic Imagination, edited by Michael Holquist, University of

## CHAPTER FOUR

Texas Press, 1983, p13.

20. Mikhaïl Bakhtin, "Epic and Novel", p13.

21. IV, p265.

22. V, p368.

23. VIII, p5.

24. VIII, p6.

25. VIII, p7.

26. VIII, p8.

27. VIII, p8.

28. VIII, p9.

29. VIII, p8.

30. VIII, p10.

31. VIII, p13.

32. VIII, p38.

33. IX, p106.

34. IX, p162.

35. VIII, p167.

36. VIII, p80.

37. VIII, p147.

38. Milan Pražić, "U prostorima nepostojanja", Izraz, 1972, XVI, 6, p587.

39. VIII, p51.

40. Svetozar Koljević, "The Linguistic Aspects of the International Theme in Roman o Londonu", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, p82.

41. VIII, p27.

42. VIII, pp195-196.

43. VIII, p195.

## CHAPTER FOUR

44. Boris Uspensky, A Poetics of Composition, University of California Press, 1983, p71.
45. IX, p357.
46. Slavko Leovac, Romansijer Miloš Crnjanski, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1981, p155.
47. IX, p320.
48. IX, p338.
49. VIII, p9.
50. IX, p106.
51. IX, p147.
52. IX, p349.
53. Hannah Arendt, Between Past and Future, Faber and Faber, London, 1961, p11.
54. IX, p352.
55. VIII, p10.
56. VIII, p5.
57. William Shakespeare, As You Like It, Act II, scene 7.
58. VIII, p34.
59. VIII, pp87-89.
60. Petar Džadžić, Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog, Nolit, Belgrade, 1976, p145.
61. VIII, p6.
62. VIII, p17.
63. Tzvetan Todorov, Introduction to Poetics, Harvester Press, Brighton, 1981, pp29-30.
64. Gerard Genette, Narrative Discourse, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1980, p216.
65. Zdenko Lešić, "The Avantgarde Nature and Artistic Range of Crnjanski's Poetry", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, p29.  
Also see Zdenko Lešić, Klasici avangarde,

## CHAPTER FOUR

Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1986, pp191-192.

66. Milan Bogdanović, "Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe", Srpski književni glasnik, 1929, XXVIII, 4, p293.

67. Mikhail Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel", The Dialogic Imagination, edited by Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press, 1983, p85.

68. Mikhail Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel", p243.

PART THREE

CHAPTER FIVE

TIME AND SELF

Introduction

Time is not a neutral, given, or natural order which indexes the succession and duration of events. Time, for Crnjanski, is modelled on the principles of simultaneity and rhythm, which he outlined in his two early essays "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" and "Za slobodni stih". These two principles rarely occur in their pure form, rather they alternate, one eventually being displaced by the other. The temporal organisation of Crnjanski's novels is marked by the different sequences of duration and succession of characters and other narrating voices. Time also functions as a creative order, since it is through their imposition of order that the characters evaluate the significance of certain events. The characters aspire towards making sense of their present, past, and potential future through focusing on the intensity of the moment, and through recognising that moment, and their whole lives, as part of other paradigms of time and history in which they have a role to play. In this sense simultaneity is the

expression and feeling of the intensity of the moment, while rhythm features in the link of that moment with all other times. Time provides a context for what Leslie A. Johnson in her study of time in Crime and Punishment terms "the broader, vital concerns of the characters" (1). In Crnjanski's novels, these broader concerns are issues of the self and the self in history.

Each novel contains two important motifs which reflect the themes of identity and being-in-time. The first is the motif of the journey. There is a journey at the heart of each novel. In Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću the diarist often discusses his journey home from the front. In Seobe Vuk Isaković travels away to war, and often reflects on the journey which he wants to make to Russia. In Druga knjiga seoba, Pavle Isaković has to make numerous trips for the Russians in the Habsburg Empire, before finally being allowed to take up a commission in the Russian army. The actual journey to Russia is narrated twice: first, in the context of the national exodus and the hardships suffered by the Serbs, and second, in the context of Pavle's own journey. In Roman o Londonu the train journey from London to Cornwall and back again links the three parts of the novel. Moreover, Rjepnin himself feels towards the end of the novel a desire to go back to Russia. The sense of return is a major factor in the journeys. The motif of the journey in each novel is an expression of the



characters' involvement in a search.

Coupled with the motif of the journey is the idea of emigration. The word is contained in the titles of his two novels Seobe and Druga knjiga seoba. The emigration is a physical movement from one country to another which the Serbs have experienced in the past. It is also the future which Vuk Isaković dreams about, and which Pavle and his cousins execute when they go to Russia. Rjepnin, in Roman o Londonu, is a Russian emigre living in London and towards the end of the novel he considers returning to Russia. The diarist in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću also recalls many travels in other lands and his homecoming. These travels, and particularly the idea of emigration, are symbols themselves of alienation and estrangement which the characters feel from their environments, and from the times in which they live. Journey, emigration, and return are all dreams which reflect the issue of identity in time. In different ways the characters react to and reflect on past, present, and future in their fears and hopes for establishing their senses of self. Existence is a search for this elusive sense of being-in-time.

In each novel the motif of the mirror also appears, and it always points to the appearance of the other. In Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću the mirror motif is important, and occurs when Čarnojević hears a voice, but when he

opens his eyes he sees himself:

Ja sam pokušao da zaspim, ali je teško išlo, on mi je jednako šaputao, a svaki čas sam kao u nekom ogledalu video nad mojom glavom sam svoje lice. Bila je to čudna noć (2).

I tried to get to sleep, but it was difficult, he kept on whispering to me, and at each moment I saw as if in a mirror above my head my own face. It was a strange night.

Vuk Isaković sees himself in a mirror as if it were someone else, the alienation which he feels from his own body emphasised by the partial details given of different parts of his body:

Opran i umiren, posmatrajući šta se u dvorištu dešava, Isaković je stajao dugo pred velikim ogledalom i gledao širok ožiljak rane na desnom ramenu, isto tako pažljivo, kao i svoje debele, opuštene obraze. Mada je hteo, i trebao, da požuri, činio je besciljne pokrete i prekidao oblačenje dugim posmatranjem sebe, u ogledalu, kakvo kod kuće nikad video nije. Veliki komadi njegovih grudi i nogu, njegove podbule oči, žućkaste, pune tačkica, a naročito njegov trbuh, dođoše mu u ogledalu i smešni i tuđi. Navlačeći svoje crvene čohe, njemu se potpuno učini da se to oblači neko drugi, a ne on, i da će to neko drugi sad izići, nakinduren, iz te sobe, a ne on (3).

Washed and calm, looking at what is happening in the courtyard, Isaković stood for a long time in front of the big mirror and looked at the broad scar of the wound on his right shoulder, and just as attentively at his fat, drooping cheeks. Although he wanted to, and should, hurry he made some aimless movements and stopped dressing, with a long stare at himself in the mirror, the like of which he had never seen at home. Large parts of his chest and legs, his swollen eyes, yellowish and speckled, and particularly his belly looked to him both

absurd and alien in the mirror. Pulling on his red tunic he was certain that it was someone else dressing, and not he, and that the someone else was about to leave the room, looking spruce, and not he.

In another passage Vuk feels himself as if two people,

"jedan koji jaše, urla, maše sabljom, gazi reke, trči po gunguli i puca iz pištolja... i drugi koji mirno, kao senka, korača kraj njega i gleda i čuti" ("one who rides, shouts, waves his sword, wades across rivers, runs through the uproar and fires from his pistol... and the other who calmly, like a shadow, marches by his side and observes and stays silent" 4).

The duality of being which Vuk feels here is also felt by Pavle in Druga knjiga seoba when he enters the Russian embassy to ask for a commission in the Russian army:

Posle podne, u određeno vreme, Isakovič je ušao u rosijsko poslanstvo, u Leopoldštatu, u pratnji Agagijanijana, kao da ga opet u arest vode. Bio je pognuo glavu i video je sebe, među mnogim ogledalima, kao da postoji još jedan Isakovič, koji ponavlja svaki njegov korak i, kroz ogledala, prolazi. Od dugog čekanja, u jednom, polumračnom predsoblju, Isakoviču se umoriše oči i njemu se činilo da, kraj njega, nikog nema, nego da ga samo njegova senka, kad prođe kraj nekog kandelabra, prati (5).

In the afternoon, at the appointed time, Isakovič entered the Russian embassy in Leopoldstadt, accompanied by Agagijanijan, as if he was being taken into custody again. He had hung his head and he saw himself, amongst the many mirrors, as if another Isakovič exists, who repeats his every step and passes through the mirrors. Isakovič's eyes

grew tired from the long period of waiting spent in a semi-dark anteroom, and it seemed to him that there was no-one by his side, but that only his shadow followed as he passed by the candelabra.

The combination of the mirror motif and the image of the shadow is used in Roman o Londonu. Rjepnin returns from Cornwall to London, where his wife is pleased to see him:

Ona se bila taman obradovala, što je uspela, da ga pošalje na obalu okeana, i da se vratio pocrneo od sunca, svež, snažan, - i ako mu je tetiva pukla, - ali je Rjepnin osećao nešto, što ona nije znala, i, što joj nije rekao: tamo, na obali okeana, u Kornualiji, pored ostalog, prvi put je osećao, da stari. U ogledalima, on je, još uvek, bio kao neki portret, kopija, francuskih, kraljeva, sa crnom bradom, ili kao slika italijanskih asasina, visok, orlovskog nosa, crnih očiju, koje su gorele, kao da u njima ima žeravica. Ali kad bi okrenuo glavu, od ogledala, to lice je postajalo blede lice, visokog čela, umornih usta, lice jednog snuždenog čoveka. Sve je uzalud. Od dana izlaska iz Rusije, on je samo svoja senka (6).

She was just cheered that she had managed to send him to the shore of the ocean, and that he returned suntanned, fresh, strong, although his tendon was broken, but Rjepnin felt something which she did not know, and which he did not tell her: there, on the ocean's shore, in Cornwall, amongst other things, he felt for the first time that he was ageing. In mirrors he was still like a portrait, a copy, of the French kings, with his black beard, or like a picture of the Italian assassins, tall, with a hooked nose, and black eyes, which smouldered as if they were live coals. But when he turned his head from the mirror that face became a pale face, with a high forehead, tired mouth, the face of a dejected man. Everything is in vain. Since the day he

left Russia, he has just been his shadow.

Each novel uses the motifs with different emphases, but each also points to the issue of identity as a factor in the thematic composition of the novels. The motif of journey combines with the motifs of dualism to reveal that the journey in each novel is a part of the characters' search for identity. The theme is expressed in relation to time variously in each novel. There are two broad contexts which cut across the chronological divisions of the novels and regroup them to reveal ideas which develop throughout Crnjanski's opus. The first and last novels are concerned more with individual identity and the search for an essence of self, in which the fictional diarist and Rjepnin inscribe themselves as narrators into the temporal frameworks of the novels. Seobe and Druga knjiga seoba reveal more of the tensions felt as the individual's desire for that authentic self comes into conflict with institutions on a social level.

#### Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću

The issue of the self in Crnjanski's first novel concerns Čarnojević and time. In the novel there are three figures or characters: Čarnojević, Rajić, and the Dalmatian sailor. However, when the novel is analysed for its relationship to time, the three figures become isolated in different temporal spheres reflecting

aspects of Čarnojević's being-in-time. Rajić is a figure associated with the past and with memories, and the sailor evokes what the diarist feels he ought to be. Čarnojević himself is writing in an unspecified present time, marked by doubt and self-questioning.

Rajić's name occurs three times, but not once in the Serbian form. His name is first made known by one of the doctors who treated him in Poland: "ona me je uvek zvala, 'Pubi'" ("she always used to call me 'Pubi'" 7). This diminutive is then followed by his name as given on his hospital chart in German:

Name: Petar Raitch.  
 Charge: Stellenloses Kanonenfutter.  
 Religion: gr. -ort.  
 Stand: ledig.  
 Alter: 23  
 Beruf: Konigsmord.  
 Diagnose: Tuberkulosis. (8)

Name: Petar Rajić.  
 Rank: Statusless Cannonfodder.  
 Religion: Greek Orthodox.  
 Status: Single.  
 Age: 23.  
 Occupation: Regicide.  
 Diagnosis: Tuberculosis.

This information comes at an important point in the text, just before the figure of the sailor is introduced. The information given about Rajić is clearly not the official hospital chart, but an ironic comment on his presence in the Austrian hospital as one of their soldiers, and on Austrian attitudes towards his nationality. The third mention of his name is given in the episode recalling his meeting with Marija and

Izabela, and his first love affair while on the coast. He is in a boat and "neko me je pozdravio sa obale, 'Addio Pierre'" ("someone called to me from the shore, 'Addio Pierre'" 9).

The three references to his name are associated with memories from before and during the war. Rajić is not a name associated with the diarist in the present of writing. His memories are personal, but also reflect the fate of his whole generation. The three variants of his name represent the major language groups of Europe, and give the impression that Rajić represents all the soldiers who fought and suffered in the war. His surname is cognate with the noun "raj" ("paradise"), adding another dimension to his memories. His memories constitute a search for a lost paradise, connected with his childhood, as if something has been lost from those days.

The memories which are associated with the name Rajić follow a discernable pattern. The episodes tend to be introduced with a general comment to indicate the time and place of action. However, in each case, at the point where the diarist's memory moves on, and especially when the reference changes from the past to the present, the memory has reached a high point of particularisation. The first section of the diary closes with the words, "U mračnim noćima, po malim kućicama i kolibama, gde se nađoh na straži sa nekoliko

momaka, je pišem mnogo čega se nerado sećam" ("In the dark nights, around the cottages and shacks where I was on guard with several lads, I am writing a great deal of what I reluctantly remember" 10). The diarist fixes his memory of the event with details of time, place, and action.

The diarist's memory then takes up the day on which the Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated. He writes, "Bio je Juna (sic). Veseo dan. Vidovdan" ("It was in June. A happy day. St Vitus' Day" 11). These opening statements are of a general nature, with little descriptive detail. He continues to recount further events associated with that day. He was arrested on suspicion of being a Serbian spy, interrogated, beaten, then taken to a detention centre where he abandons this episode:

Ja sam tužno gledao unaokolo; prepadoh se, skidoh bele rukavice i sedoh među neke senke u mračnom hodniku, što su strašno zaudarale, gurale me i jednako šaputale. "Jel', ej, daj malo duvana" (12).

I looked around sadly; I was frightened, I took off my white gloves and sat down amongst some shadows in the dark corridor who stank terribly, pushed me and continuously whispered, "Hey, you, give some baccy".

The details of this closing scene are delivered with greater clarity and starkness than at the beginning of the episode. The diarist describes the location, monitoring his actions and those of the others. Colours



are sharply contrasted ("white" and "dark"), while the sense of smell ("stank"), touch ("pushed"), hearing ("whispered"), and taste ("baccy") are all appealed to. The description of the memory has taken on the appearance of actual perception, at which point the episode ends. The following one begins in the war, and then alternates with scenes from his childhood.

Much of what he recalls from childhood is vague and could be culled from a number of conflated memories. One short section recalling the war is closed with a sentence which expresses a clear idea of location and action, "Kašljucao sam, i išao sam za kolima natovarenim vrelim, svežim hlebovima" ("I was coughing, and I walked behind a cart loaded with hot, fresh loaves" 13). The following section, in which he develops the reference to his childhood, opens with a comment which links his military service, when he was sick with tuberculosis, with his childhood memories of illness, "Bolesti su bile moji najlepši doživljaji. Oblačili su me u belo i metali me u prozor; a ljudi su zastajali i gledali me" ("Illnesses were my loveliest experiences. They would dress me in white and put me in the window; and people would stop and look at me" 14). That whole section on his childhood then closes with another reference to a precise location and event, "Voz je stenjao i peo se na brežuljke kraj Dunava" ("The train groaned and climbed the low hills by the Danube" 15). In the next section

the diarist turns again to the war when his battalion was on the move.

This first part of the diary, until the embedded narrative concerning the sailor, continues in the same vein. The diarist develops his memories from childhood, the war, the death of his mother and marriage to Maca, in a non-progressive fashion. The memories change to another time once they have achieved a clarity of location and particularisation. The details imitate perception, and then stimulate memories along a private chain of association with another episode from the past. Sometimes, the memories evoke a response which shows a link between those past times and the present.

The diarist suggests at the very beginning of the novel that there is a link between his memories and the present:

Jesen, i život bez smisla. Proveo sam noć u zatvoru sa nekim Ciganima. Vučem se po kavanama. Sednem do prozora, i zagledam se u maglu i u rumena, mokra, žuta drveta. Gde je život? (16).

Autumn, and life without meaning. I spent the night in gaol with some Gypsies. I drag myself around the cafes. I sit next to the window, and begin to stare at the fog and at the reddish, wet, yellow trees. Where is life?

The memory of the night in gaol is quickly followed by his questioning of his life. Most of the references to the present include some form of question, reflecting the doubt in the diarist's mind. The section which opens "Kome ja ovo pišem?" ("For whom am I writing

this? 17). closes thus:

Ništa nema smisla, sve je propalo u ove tri godine. Strahovito, uplašeno, pažljivo ja gledam u njima život i držim ga rukama koje drhte, i gledam oko sebe šume i puteve i nebo (18).

Nothing makes any sense, everything failed in those three years. Horrified, frightened, attentively I look at my life in them and I hold it in my hands which shake, and I look around myself at the forests and the paths and the sky.

The diarist is trying to look at life through his experience of the war, and Rajić personifies his memory of himself. The diarist is afraid and apprehensive, yet wants to look "attentively". The memory evokes a response in the present as the diarist considers his life in the war and looks around himself. However, when a point is reached when the memory might achieve meaning and significance in the present, the diarist turns to another episode. Bergson describes this type of memory-image:

Little by little it comes into view like a condensing cloud; from the virtual state it passes into the actual; and as its outline becomes more distinct and its surface takes on colour, it tends to imitate perception (19).

The diarist does not contemplate his memories in the present "actual" state, but continues to look at them as objects which he holds in his hands, distanced and reified from the present. The "I" of the text does not represent a single, stable personality. In different contexts the "I" represents the diarist who is writing

in the present, and Rajić, who is both representative of his self in memory, and of a whole generation.

Following the embedded narrative about the sailor, the diary continues in a similar vein. The diarist recalls his love affair with the Polish nurse, his first love affair, and his return home. However, there is a greater frequency of questions in which the diarist reveals the general anxiety which he feels about his life: "Ko zna šta je Život" ("Who knows what life is" 20); "Greh? Život? Ko zna šta je to" ("Sin? Life? Who knows what it is" 21); "Život se ne menja. On prolazi" ("Life doesn't change. It passes by" 22). The more frequent references to his journey home give the diarist a greater sense of urgency as he not only approaches home, but also the present time of writing. The gathering repetitions of certain phrases and words link together episodes from his life in more complex associations. Recalling the time when he was in the hospital during the war, he evokes the atmosphere of his feverish mind and the temporal complexity of his present of writing in combination with different memories:

Ljudi su kašljali sve gore i jednog dana  
pade jedan grdan Čeh kraj mene na  
stepenicama sa ustima ogrezlim u krvi.  
Ja ga pogledah zapanjeno. Umro je posle  
tri dana. A proleće je dolazilo.  
Ververice su zabasale iz šuma čak u naše  
sobe. Po krovu pada neka žuta tama zorom  
svakog dana od kada sam se vratio. Tama,  
tama je ta topla svetlost što me rano  
budi. U primorju, negde daleko sad je  
proleće. Greh? Život? Ko zna šta je  
to. U primorju je sad proleće. U ovakve

dane sam prvi put naučio da ljubim. Bio sam tada veseo i mlad. Sećam se, sećam se, tada mi je majka bila prvi put teško bolna (23).

People were coughing ever worse and one day a huge Czech fell over beside me on the steps with his mouth gushing blood. I looked at him astounded. He died after three days. But spring was on its way. The squirrels wandered from the forests even into our rooms. A yellow gloom falls across the roof every day at dawn since I returned. Gloom, gloom is the warm light which wakes me early. On the coast, somewhere far away it is now spring. Sin? Life? Who knows what it is. On the coast it is now spring. On days like these I first learnt to kiss. I was then happy and young. I remember, I remember, then my mother was taken badly ill for the first time.

The above passage exemplifies the level of temporal complexity which the novel achieves. The memory of the hospital and the death of the Czech are associated with the time of year, spring. The Czech died when the rest of nature began to burst into life. This life touched upon the patients in the hospitals by the appearance of the squirrels after months of hibernation. The room in the hospital and the time of year remind him of the present, his room at home, and spring, and also of the past when he had his first love affair at a time when his mother was ill. The memory of his stay in hospital is one temporal level, the questions prompted by this memory are linked both to the present time of writing, and another event of his first love. "Sad je proleće" ("Now it is spring") is a triple reference to all three levels as they co-exist in the diarist's mind. The

memories associated with Rajić only remain in a virtual state, never communicating their full meaning to the diarist in the present.

Like Rajić, Čarnojević's name is only revealed indirectly, by a reference he makes about his father in the dream sequence involving the sailor. This is the only reference in the novel to the diarist's name:

Ah, dragi moj, jeste li slušali za moga oca, pitajte za njegovo ime po manastirima sremskim svud ga znaju, pitajte samo za drvara Egona Čarnojevića, za onog što je i zimi i leti nosio beo šešir (24).

Ah, my dear chap, have you heard of my father, ask for his name at the monasteries of Srem, everywhere they know him, ask only for the woodcutter Egon Čarnojević, for the one who used to wear a white hat in both winter and summer.

In order to examine all the implications which the figure of Rajić holds for the diarist, he has to be set against the dream figure of the sailor. The embedded narrative about him begins with a different emphasis from most of the other episodes. The diarist begins by stating his desire to narrate, not by assuming the link of association between memories, in his statement "hoću da Vam pričam" ("I want to tell you" 25). And what he wants to tell began one night in April, of which he says, "Ja je nikad zaboraviti neću" ("I shall never forget it" 26). Instead of prefacing or interspersing the episode with the refrain "sećam se" ("I remember"), this is an event which cannot be forgotten. He later

says, "Hoću da ti pričam san, jedan moj san" ("I want to relate to you a dream, a dream of mine" 27). So, the section which concerns the sailor is marked as different from the others, as it is a dream, and something which is not to be forgotten rather than a reluctant memory.

There are many points of contact between Čarnojević, Rajić, and the sailor. The diarist transforms the refrain "sećam se" ("I remember") to "sećao se" ("he remembered" 28). On another level the sailor's mother appears to Čarnojević like his own mother, and he remarks that "kad pričaše o njenoj sedoj kosi meni se učini da snavam, toliko je ličila na moju majku" ("when he used to talk about her grey hair I thought I was dreaming, she looked so much like my own mother" 29). The sailor's father is like the diarist's father too:

Ah, nikad ne mogu da zaboravim tu ženu.  
Ona nije bila nikad zaljubljena, nju  
nikad niko nije milovao, tukli su je,  
mamili je pijani i obesni i ona je  
jednako ribala pod. Njegov otac beše  
veseo čovek, kao i moj (30).

Ah, I can never forget that woman. She  
was never in love, she was never caressed  
by anyone, they used to beat her, drunk  
and crazy they enticed her and she  
continued to scrub the floor. His father  
was a happy man, like mine.

The two characters are associated by family likeness, Čarnojević being led to remark that he felt the sailor was "više nego brat" ("more than a brother" 31), and the sailor remarks to him simply that "vi ličite na

mene" ("you look like me" 32). The latter phrase is later echoed in the diary when Čarnojević visits an old friend of his father, who "kaže, da sasvim ličim na njega" ("says that I look very much like him" 33). His father died when he was a child. The associations between the sailor and Čarnojević are deepened by the contrasts between them.

The diary as a confessional monologue reveals an obsession with guilt and death in memories associated with the figure of Rajić. All his relationships with women are coloured by these feelings, and in them there is a close association between Eros and Thanatos. His relationships with women are unsuccessful except for the nurse in whose care he is placed like a child. The following comment on his relationship with his Polish nurse gives a clue for the success of that affair:

Ona me je smestila u zasebnu sobu, čiji su prozori gledali u zamrle prozore jedne stare crkve. Bilo je kao u detinjstvu (34).

She settled me into a separate room, whose windows looked onto the frozen windows of an old church. It was like in childhood.

The nurse is presented as a mother figure in Čarnojević's memory, which suggests that one reason for his intention to write his memories is a search for a lost innocence. Similarly, in his memory of Izabela and Marija when on holiday one year, there is a sharp contrast between his view of Izabela, with whom he



spends the night, and of Marija, who is outside in the yard when he wakes:

Probudio sam se kad sunce granu. Videh je polugolu do sebe i neki gadan osmeh ispuni me svog. Beše opet jutro i kao da sam osetio, da to ne beše sunce što me je probudilo, nego jedan glas, ustadoh i pridoh prozoru. Pod prozorom stajaše Marija i pevaše. Prala je rublje. Iz njenog lika i golih ramena bljestaše zora. Ja se trgoh i pogledah na postelju. Videh modre žile na telu izljubljene žene i okretoh glavu (35).

I woke up when the sun rose. I saw her half-naked next to me and a repulsive smile filled the whole of me. It was morning again and I felt as if it was not the sun which had woken me but a voice. I got up and went to the window. Under the window stood Marija and she was singing. She was washing clothes. From her face and bare shoulders shone the dawn. I flinched and stared at the bed. I saw the blue veins on the body of the woman I had loved and I turned my head away.

The description of Izabela contrasts sharply with the purity associated with Marija. Izabela is depicted as a bodily figure of this earth, her mortality emphasised against the purity of Marija who not only bears the same name as the mother of God but is associated with dawn, light, and the cosmic forces of eternity. The diarist is similarly repulsed by his wife, Maca. Finally, the diarist reveals the basis of his revulsion in the close connection he sees between physical life in all its aspects and death, the end of individual time, as he describes in a scene from his journey home when he sleeps on the grave of a thirteen-year old girl:

Spavao sam dobro. Kad se probudih videh da sam spavao na grobu. Ona se zvala Neve Benusi. Da, ležala je mirno, pod zemljom. Živela je trinaest godina. To je bila moja najčistija bračna noć (36).

I slept well. When I woke I saw that I had been sleeping on a grave. She was called Neve Benusi. Yes, she lay quietly, under the earth. She lived for thirteen years. It was my purest wedding night.

The feeling of shame and guilt arises from the fear of retribution, with death as the ultimate retribution.

The sailor, on the other hand, is described as the opposite and is seen as successful in his relationships with women:

Sećam se stojali smo pred Kairom. Jedna vrlo bogata Amerikanka i njeno društvo posetiše brod, a on joj je bio dodeljen za kavaljera, jer je krasno govorio sa ženama, a jos krasnije plesao (37).

I remember we were tied up at Cairo. A very rich American woman and her friends were visiting the ship, and he was detailed to her as a gallant, since he spoke beautifully with women, and danced even more beautifully.

As if to emphasise the contrast between the two and echo all aspects of the diarist's personality and memories, there is even mention of a girl of thirteen associated with Čarnojević, but who is not associated with death:

Oni su pošli u lov na srne. Bila je navršila trinaest godina. On je svako veče skakao sa broda i vikao grčke neke krasne medene reči, i plivao do jedne šume, gde je ona čekala (38).

They set off to hunt deer. She was thirteen. He would jump from the ship every evening and shout some beautiful

Greek honeyed words, and swim to a forest, where she would be waiting.

The sailor displays no sense of shame or guilt, there is no confusion of Eros with Thanatos, and no fear of retribution. He and Rajić function as aspects of Čarnojević's self. Rajić is the "I" of the diarist's memories. His time is static in that it is repressed and locked in the past. He is a projection of the diarist's memories of what he once was, and that time is largely a repressed time of awakening from innocence. The sailor represents a possibility of change. He is a dream figure whom the diarist feels he ought to be. They are both distanced from the "I" of the diarist whose being-in-time is set in an isolated present. He surveys his life, and from this vantage point is cut off from his life, as suggested in the following image:

I ništa me ne vezuje ni za dobro ni za zlo. I tako sam se oslobodio svega. Ja držim moj mali život sav potrešen i uplašen u rukama, čudeći mu se, kao što drži crni evnuh prsten sultanije u rukama dok se one kupa. On je u mojim rukama a nije moj. I sve što je oko mene moje je i nije moje (39).

And nothing binds me either to good or to evil. And so I am liberated from everything. I hold my small life in my hands, shocked and afraid, wondering at it, as the black eunuch holds the sultana's ring in his hands while she bathes. It is in my hands and it is not mine. And everything which is around me is mine and is not mine.

The diarist's vantage point gives him a sense of liberation, but a liberation which alienates him from

the values which would give meaning to his memories.

The rupture between the time of memories and the present time of writing is redrawn in the time scale which the sailor represents:

Na svom topu, na palubi, u noći zvezdane,  
na sinjem moru, kad ne bi video nigde  
ničeg do neba i vođu, on bi bio gospodar  
sveta (40).

On his gun, on the deck, in the starry  
nights, on the blue sea, when he would  
see nothing anywhere except the sky and  
the water, he would be lord of the world.

He acknowledges the past in the present, he does not live life in fear but with a sense of purpose looking to the vastness of an infinite future, symbolised in the surrounding vastness of the sea and sky. The references which he makes to Sumatra echo Crnjanski's poem of that name and the interconnectedness of all things in each moment:

Ne, nije više znao šta je dobro, a šta  
zlo, niti je znao zašto govori toliko o  
životu, nije se mešao u prepirke, i nije  
više verovao ni u šta, do u neke plave  
obale na Sumatri. Tamo je njegova  
sudbina (41).

No, he no longer knew what was good, and  
what bad, nor did he know why he talks so  
much about life, he did not meddle in  
squabbles, and he no longer believed in  
anything, except some blue shores on  
Sumatra. There is his fate.

The sailor echoes the diarist's separation from values. His separation does not result in alienation, but in a liberation which approaches the transcendental nature of sumatraism. He is a projection of the diarist's

psyche which exists beyond the objective knowledge of everyday things and inhabits a world of the intuitive. In temporal terms, the sailor represents what Bergson referred to as pure duration:

Pure duration is the form which the succession of our conscious states assumes when our ego lets itself live, when it refrains from separating its present state from its former states (42).

His world is one in which time does not divide the subject from experience. He contains within each moment past and present.

Neither Rajić nor the sailor is the narrator of the novel. They are both projections of different aspects of Čarnojević's psyche. Rajić is a figure who is determined by the repressed memories of the diarist who is searching for answers to his questions and to his feelings of guilt. However, his re-creation of the past becomes a means of avoiding action and establishing his presence. The implications and significance of his memories do not surface in the present. His memories swamp life, and reduce all time to meaningless absurdity, transient, and with no future, in which everything will pass into oblivion as he restates his disdain for the past, and dismissal of any potential future. On the other hand, in his dream about the sailor, the diarist remarks that "znali smo da nam je budućnost na ulici" ("we knew that our future was on the streets" 43). The sailor presents a different model

of time in which there is a future. The future is dynamic in the chosen metaphor which calls for change.

Rajić and the sailor function purely as tropes. They are signs which do not constitute or represent character in mimetic terms. The confusion felt by the diarist, the lack of direction in his life, the rupture between who he is now at the time of writing, and who he once was and who he ought to be, is allegorically represented in the text in one of the references to his journey home. He boards a train for home, a symbolic gesture signifying the approach to the present time through memory:

Prošao sam kraj vozova i pitao sam za  
brzi na jug. Hteo sam da se penjem, kad  
mi pride neki čovek sa gajtanima i zapita  
kuda ću. "Na jug." On mi reče da će taj  
na sever. Ja ga pogledah i zapitah, "Zar  
to nije sve jedno?" (44).

I walked past the trains and asked for  
the express to the south. I was about to  
climb aboard, when a man wearing braids  
approached and asked where I wanted to  
go. "To the south." He told me that  
train was going to the north. I looked  
at him and asked, "Isn't it really all  
the same?"

The diarist's lack of concern for the train's direction mirrors the associative shifting backwards and forwards through his memories. It also contrasts the progressive forward movement of memory into the present or actual consciousness, as described by Bergson when he states that "the memory-image passes, by a dynamic progress, into the perception in which it becomes actual" (45).

against the diarist's tendency to confine his experience to the irrecoverable past, personified by Rajić.

In his writing the diarist's re-creations of his life in memory and life in dream are allegorically represented by the two figures of Rajić and the sailor. They are signs in which are codified the diarist's being-in-time as a dialectic. This type of dialectic has been described by Paul de Man:

It becomes a conflict between a conception of the self seen in its authentically temporal predicament and a defensive strategy that tries to hide from this negative self-knowledge (46).

Rajić and the sailor are sites for the repercussions of the diarist's realisation of his "temporal predicament". The diarist delves into his past and dreams, yet from the knowledge which they provide cannot form an image of his self in the present of writing. His experience and images of self are isolated in other spheres, temporally isolated from the now of writing.

The diarist frequently interjects the phrase "sećam se" ("I rememebr") into his diary. This is the "I" of the diarist, a sign of his writing in the present. His memories are reluctant, unhappy memories of unfulfilled and repressed desire. Time in this context is the structure of frustration. However, he cannot forget his memories, although he can refuse to face their truth. The inability to forget is a paradox of the human condition described by Nietzsche:

Consider the herds that are feeding yonder: they know not the meaning of yesterday of to-day; they graze and ruminate, move or rest, from morning to night, from day to day, taken up with their little loves and hates, at the mercy of the moment, feeling neither melancholy nor satiety. Men cannot see them without regret, for even in the pride of his humanity he looks enviously on the beast's happiness. He wishes simply to live without satiety or pain, like the beast; yet it is all in vain, for he will not change places with it. He may ask the beast, "Why do you not look at me and speak to me of your happiness?" The beast wants to answer, "Because I always forget what I wished to say,": but he forgets this answer too; and is silent; and the man is left to wonder (47).

For Nietzsche the path to the happiness of the beast is to forget, but human beings cannot voluntarily forget. Their lives are a continual stream of associations, impressions, sensations, and memories. The diarist rejects the past as insignificant by such phrases as "sve to nije važno, jer je prošlo" ("all this is not important, for it has passed" 48). He also rejects the future which he believes will similarly be consigned to insignificance by such phrases as "sve će to proći i sve će se zaboraviti" ("all that will pass and everything will be forgotten" 49). Time separates the subject from experience. The only hope is for "bolje stoleće" ("a better age" 50) which will only come after his death, casting doubt on the validity of his life. Thus the diarist comes to the conclusion that, "Život se ne menja. On prolazi" ("Life does not change. It passes



by" 51). By avoiding the meaning of the past the diarist hides from self-knowledge. His sense of being as personified by Rajić is only ever historical, since all significance is locked in an irrecoverable past. Consequently, Čarnojević becomes a Hamlet-type figure who is unable to act.

The sailor presents an alternative to the repressed consciousness of being-in-time as inevitably historical. His function as in relation to Rajić was described in Dedinac's early review of the novel, although he considered Rajić to be the diarist and Čarnojević the sailor, a result of the deliberate blurring of identity in the novel. Dedinac's description of the sailor as the diarist's "double, čovek njegovih uzburkanih misli" ("double, a man of his own anxious thoughts" 52), is echoed in this analysis, but also qualified in that Čarnojević's sense of being-in-time is further fragmented. The sailor is captured in a mirror image as part of a dream, written by an author already resigned to the inevitable loss of the meaning of all experience. The meaning of experience is hidden in Rajić. However, the critic Radomir Konstantinović considers the sailor as the product of the diarist's striving for a defence against the lack of sense and purpose in the present when he writes that "Količina gluposti i besmilica narastala je paralelno sa neminovnom unutaranjom potrebom čoveka da se brani" ("The quantity of nonsense and

pointlessness grew parallel with the unavoidable inner need of the man to defend himself" 53). On the one hand, Čarnojević creates Rajić who represents the repressed past, and on the other hand, he creates the sailor who represents a potential way out of the impasse. The sailor represents what Rajić was not and could not be, an alternative being-in-time in which the traces of the diarist's repressed psyche achieve a new significance.

However, the sailor only ever remains potential. The dream closes and the text returns to the diarist, who is caught between the insufficiency in life embodied in Rajić of a repressed past, and an anticipation in the sailor of a potential present and future. Čarnojević's writing of his diary has itself been an exercise in rehearsing the meaning of being-in-time. The diary's lack of temporal markers to indicate when and over what period it was written is countered by this emphasis on time. Through his writing of his self in memory and in dream he has revealed "time as a function of the internal structure of consciousness" (54). Rajić and the sailor are products of his creation, representations of his psyche in memory, and on a transcendental plane. The lack of a unified subject as the expression of consciousness, also leads to the conclusion that time is not a unified structure, but is split amongst the various personae assumed by the ego. The diarist opens

his diary with a paragraph stating that existence has no meaning. His anxieties and fears, his refusal to consider the truth of experience, are countered by an alternative view. The positive result for the diarist is contained in the defiance of his closing statement, "Ali ako umrem, pogledaću poslednji put nebo, utehu moju, i smešiću se" ("But if I die, I shall take one last look at the sky, my comfort, and I shall smile" 55). The anxiety caused by guilt and fear of retribution is transformed in the closing lines to the suggestion of a limited salvation in the future.

#### Roman o Londonu

In both Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću and his last novel Roman o Londonu, Crnjanski includes certain events which are autobiographical. They also link issues of self and identity with the personal time of the main characters as perceived by them in memory. In his commentaries from Itaka i komentari he describes an incident from his war experience when he was diagnosed as having tuberculosis:

Pa ipak, sutradan, pri opštem pregledu, dr Dumić je pronašao da imam bolesna pluća i tolika je bila disciplina, u Austriji, u vojsci, da su i dva mlada lekara, Mađara, potvrdila tu dijagnozu.

Otuda tuberkuloza kod junaka romana u Dnevniku o Čarnojeviću (56).

Nevertheless, on the following day at a general examination, Dr Dumić discovered that my lungs were infected, and such was the discipline in Austria, in the army,

that two young doctors, Hungarians, confirmed the diagnosis.

This is the source of the hero's tuberculosis in the novel Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću.

Crnjanski spent many years in London after the war as a political emigre. He and Vida had little income, and it was difficult to find work. Vida made some money by sewing at home, as does Rjepnin's wife in Roman o Londonu, and he worked in both a shoe shop and later as a deliveryman for a bookshop, as does Rjepnin. In the archive of material kept by the Crnjanski Foundation there are a number of letters and other documents from that period of his life. Some of the contents have been transcribed and incorporated into the novel (57). His experiences in London led him to consider suicide (58), an act which Rjepnin executes.

However, the issue of being-in-time is presented by the characters in different ways. The diarist in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću remains distanced from his past. Rjepnin's attitude towards the past goes through certain changes during the course of Roman o Londonu. First, he regards the past as a means of escape from the problems of the present. Second, the past becomes more than an escape as Rjepnin finds the source of his identity in the past. This feature of Rjepnin's crisis is more acute following the departure of Nada for the

United States. Third, Rjepnin's dependence on his memory of who he once was reinforces the breakdown of the division between illusion and reality. In the final stage, the disintegration of Rjepnin's personality is traced in the very manner of his suicide. The lack of distinction between illusion and reality is expressed within the stage motif which is developed in the novel.

There are two issues which burden Rjepnin from the beginning of the novel. They are the questions of national identity, and the material conditions which he and Nada are forced to endure as émigrés. Their material conditions have changed dramatically over the years, and in London are felt most keenly:

Slomilo ga je, to, da im se život, kad su iz Rusije izišli, pretvorio sad već godinama u neprekidnu samoću, bedu, besposlenost, kao neki strašan san, iz kojeg ne može da se probudi. Nigde nije mogao da se skrasi, nigde ni da živi i zarađuje kao drugi ljudi. Život im je postao ne samo težak, nego i čudnovat, besmislen, neverovatan (59).

It dejected him that their life, when they left Russia, had changed for years now into continual solitude, poverty, unemployment, like some nightmare from which he could not wake himself. Nowhere could he settle down, nowhere could he live and earn a living like other people. Their life had become not only difficult, but strange, pointless, incredible.

London and the English bear the brunt of the blame for their state of affairs. Rjepnin cannot understand how, as a soldier in the Russian army when Russia and England were allies in the First World War, as someone who

helped put out the fires during the blitz of the Second World War, he can be treated so off-handedly. The only source of income they have had for over a year has been from charitable trusts set up by the Russian and Polish émigré communities, and one from an organisation "nekih, engleskih, žena, koje su osnovale: Klub boraca za individualnu slobodu" ("of some English women who founded the Club of Fighters for Individual Freedom" 60).

Rjepnin criticises the English attitude towards money, since status and worth are linked only to wealth:

Novac ima, u vremenu u kom živimo, snagu Sunca, snagu, koju suze više nemaju. Sreća ljudska je sad u novcu. Englezi su od trgovine načinili religiju. Kad se u Londonu pita, ko je ko, koliko vredi ko, - "How much is he worth", - misli se: koliko ima? Koliko funti? A mi, u ruskoj emigraciji, sad, ne vredimo ništa (61).

Money has, in the times in which we live, the power of the Sun, a power which tears no longer hold. Human happiness is now in money. The English have made a religion of trade. When someone in London asks, who is who, how worthy someone is, "How much is he worth," one thinks: how much does he have? How many pounds? And we, in emigration from Russia, now, are not worth anything.

Rjepnin's puts his lack of money down to a contest of values, in which his military background has no meaning:

Oficir nigde nije riba u vodi, kad izgubi otadžbinu, nego riba na pesku. Englezi nam priznaju slavu. U nama se klanjaju celom čovečanstvu, kao što se Dostojevski prostitutki klanjao. Samo ne znaju kako bi, u svom knjigovodstvu knjižili vernost savezničku (62).

An officer is like a fish out of water when he has lost his fatherland, like a fish on the sand. The English recognise our glory. In us they respect the whole of mankind, as Dostoevsky respected the prostitute. Only they don't know how to enter Allied loyalty into their credit and debit columns.

Rjepnin's background and his inherited cultural and family values belong to a different world:

Ja sam Rus, Nada. Za mene ovakav život, kao što ga živim i kao što ga žive ovi ovde, za novac, za uštede, za osiguranja, nema, ni privlačnosti, ni smisla. Ja ću, do kraja, misliti o našim bivšim vojnicima, i o Rusiji, - do kraja (63).

I am a Russian, Nada. For me this life which I live and which these here live, for money, savings, insurance, holds no attraction or point. I shall, to the end, think of our former soldiers, and about Russia - to the end.

Rjepnin sees no future for himself in a culture which places such a high value on money. The promise of future comfort and long-term financial security are criteria alien to the aristocratic code of honour which he learned as a child and youth. His Russian identity and his disdain for petty bourgeois values are linked.

For Rjepnin the material conditions which shape his life in London are transformed into the symptoms of an existential problem involving his whole identity of who he once was and what he has since then become.

Rjepnin's first answer to the overburdensome problem of living in the present is joint suicide for him and Nada, to whom he remarks that "moraju prestat i da žive"

("they must stop living" 64). However, he changes his mind and suggests that Nađa go to her aunt in the United States, "Promenio sam mišljenje o samoubistvu, Nađa. Poslaću vas vašoj tetki u Ameriku. Nećete vi, u starosti, prositi po Londonu. To neću" ("I have changed my mind about suicide, Nađa. I shall send you to your aunt in America. You won't, in your old age, beg around London. I won't have that" 65). Rjepnin feels particularly conscious that his wife is forced to share this life with him, and the opportunity that she go away would relieve him of that burden.

He and Nađa have always thought about the past as an escape from the pain of the present, as is suggested in the description "Tada, pre nego što zaspe, u ćutanju, oboje žive u prošlosti. Ona se seća prvih godina njihovog braka, a on Rusije" ("Then, before falling asleep, in silence, both live in the past. She recalls the first years of their marriage, and he Russia" 66). The material problems confronting Rjepnin take on their existential colouring when he finds his identity as a Russian challenged. The deepening of the problem in his psyche can be measured by the intensity of his memories, and the context in which they arise. Rjepnin is considered to be a Pole by many of the English people with whom he comes into contact. The reason for their confusion is that "razoružanih Poljaka bilo je, tada, u Londonu mnogo" ("there were many demobbed Poles in



London at the time" 67)). When Rjepnin goes to the Labour Exchange to find work, the clerk assumes that he is Polish, and even when told that he is Russian continues to assume that he is Polish. The episode includes a minor incident in which Rjepnin has to spell out his name, and becomes angry at the clerk's inability to understand correctly what he is saying. He responds scornfully to Rjepnin's temper remarking, "Treba da daje tačne podatke. Oficir, diplomat? Šta je? Ko je?" ("He should give his exact details. Officer, diplomat? What is he? Who is he?" 68). This is one of a number of occasions on which Rjepnin finds that his name and national identity are not taken seriously, including occasions on which it is suggested to him that he change his name to one which the English can handle more easily (69).

Following the challenge to his identity in the Labour Exchange, Rjepnin's memories begin to take on a new urgency:

Kad je izišao iz te Berze rada, otpočinje opet hodanje kroz ruševine, i kroz maglu, i kroz zelene oči mačaka. Treba opet koračati, koračati, pored zida, dok mu u mozgu jure slike Kerča, Rusije, ukrcavanja, flote u Alžiru, poderanih čizama, pijanki, tuča i odlaska, sa ženom koja plače, u Prag, gde mu je ruski komitet našao mesta (70).

When he came out of the Labour Exchange, he again began the walk across the ruins, and through the fog, and across the cat's eyes. He again has to step, step, by the wall, while in his mind rush pictures of Kerch, Russia, embarkation, the fleet in

Algiers, worn boots, drinking bouts,  
fights and departure with a crying wife  
to Prague, where the Russian Committee  
found a place for him.

Memories of his wife, leaving Russia, his army days in  
Russia all recur with mounting frequency. On this  
occasion he recalls standing in Westminster with his  
father, where he is now standing thirty years later. He  
accompanied his father on a visit to England during the  
First World War, but the image again brings to mind the  
question of identity:

Bio je sa ocem u prolazu. Među  
generalima. Rusija je tada bila velika  
sila. Kenterberijski arhiepiskop držao  
je govor, o ruskim poredama, i žrtvama, i  
o caru. A sad. Šta je? Ko je? Prolazi  
kao senka, ako uopšte ima još senku.  
Prolazi kao da je slep (71).

He was with his father in the corridor.  
Amongst the generals. Russia was then a  
Great Power. The archbishop of  
Canterbury gave a sermon, about the  
Russian victories, about her sacrifices,  
and about the tsar. And now. What is  
he? Who is he? He is passing through  
like a shadow, if he still has a shadow  
at all. He is passing through as if  
blind.

It is images from his memory which spark off the  
questions "What is he? Who is he?". He compares his  
life in the past with the present. The figure from the  
past is recognisable, has a fixed identity, but in the  
present he does not know who or what he is. The image  
of himself as a shadow occurs elsewhere in the novel, as  
if he has no substance and is only a reflection of a  
personality.

The passage continues to follow Rjepnin in the underground, where the atmosphere takes on an air of unreality; the trains being "kao neka čudovišta" ("like some monsters") and he himself sitting and feeling "kao da je od voska" ("as if he were made of wax" 72). As he reaches his destination, the verb is given in the first person plural, as if the prince is in conversation with one of his inner voices, Barlov, or Jim, or John. The comment which follows links his train journey with the progress of his memories, "Knjaz, - dakle, tu smo? Dotle smo stigli? Bio je jedinac. A gde mu je mati? Ne zna da li je živa, ako je uopšte još u Sankt Petersburgu" ("Prince - we are here then? Where have we got to? He was an only child. And where is his mother? He doesn't know if she is still alive, if she is still to be found in St Petersburg at all" 73). Whenever thinking of Russia he never acknowledges that the revolution happened and the changes it brought, including the new placenames.

From the beginning all Rjepnin's thoughts and actions have reminded him of Russia. On seeing a restaurant where he and Nada used to go when they first arrived in London, he is transported back again to Petersburg:

Njihovo, rusko, tadašnje, društvo, dolazilo je, tu, i da se igra, uz topovsku grmljavinu, a igralo se u podrumu. Silazilo se niz lestve, pa su se suknje žena, - kao što se, uostalom, predviđalo, - širilo, pri silasku, kao

crne, svilene, lale.

Okolo toga bilo je mnogo smeđa, kao u Sankt Petersburgu (74).

Their Russian friends at the time used to come here to dance, to the roar of cannon, when they danced in the cellar. They used to go down a ladder, and the skirts of the women - as had been foreseen - ballooned on descent like black, silk tulips.

There was a great deal of laughter at that, as in St Petersburg.

The only light moments which he feels in London are those memories of Russia:

Svetli su samo oni trenuci, kad, u njegovom životu, u Londonu, kad mu se u mislima, pojavi njegova Neberežnaja. To je omiljeno selo i imanje njegove matere, koje mu je poklonila (75).

Only those moments are light, when, in his life, in London, when in his thoughts, his Nyebyerezhnaya appears to him. It is the favourite village and estate of his mother, who gave it to him.

The inner voices which confront Rjepnin, and his memories, link him to his past life in Russia before the revolution.

At an early point in the novel Rjepnin reflects on the links between the past and the present which his memories bring, but the objective stance he takes in the following passage is rarely repeated. While looking at an advertisement for a job as a chimney-sweep in Reading, he remembers a poem about Reading Gaol which his teacher required him to learn, and another poem about an Irish Guardsman who killed his mistress. The same teacher showed a picture of the Irish Guards to him

and his class-mates:

Gde su sad njegovi školski drugovi, junkeri, i ta učiteljica, koja pokazuje crvenu uniformu irske garde, na slici? Ta skrletna uniforma i ime te varoši, Reding, ostali su mu, za uvek, u pameti. Bili su, dakle, došli po njega, u njegovo detinjstvo, već pre toliko godina, - samo on to nije znao? Ono što je nekad bilo, i ono što se događa sa njim, sad, u sadašnjosti, u neakvoj su, dakle, čudnavatoj vezi? A on sad, eto, želeo bi da bude odžaćar u toj varoši. Kako je čudna ta bliskost, onoga što se davno dešavalo, i što je prošlo, i onog, što se sad sa njim događa. Možda i sa onim, što će se dogoditi, u budućnosti? Kako su strašne te nagle promene u životu ljudi. Njih, dakle, nije moguće predosetiti, niti, - promenom zanimanja, sustići? (76).

Where are his school friends now, the cadets, and that teacher who shows the red uniform of the Irish Guard on a picture? The scarlet uniform and the name of that town, Reading, have remained in his mind for ever. They had, then, come for him, to take him back to his childhood so many years ago - only he did not know it? That which once was, and that which is happening to him now in the present, are then in some sort of strange connection? And he would now like to be a chimney sweep in that town. How strange is the proximity of that which happened long ago, and which is past, to that which is happening to him now. Perhaps even to that which will happen in the future? How terrible are the sudden changes in people's lives. It is not possible, then, to foresee them, nor by a change of profession to overtake them.

The links between his past and present are lost to him. The prince is alienated from the pattern and shape of his own life. The result reinforces his emotional empathy with the past and the figure who appears to him from the past as the man he once was. One of the

features of Rjepnin's memory which binds him closely to those years before the revolution lies in his omission of the thirty years between leaving Russia and the present. The absence of these years from his memory is both a sign of his alienation from his life's pattern, and serves to reinforce the closeness he feels with his identity as a Russian. By rejecting the events which would chronicle the changes in his life, he denies change, and perhaps even believes that he can outwit those changes and realise an identity based upon what he had once been, as a Russian. His view of being Russian has as much to do with a scale of values arising from a particular way of life as with outward signs of national identity.

Nada presents a different view to living in time from her husband's obsession with the past. His initial desire for suicide is not shared by her, she believes that their material circumstances will improve, and that he will find work. It is said of Nada that, "ona je želela da živi, a ne da u samoubistvu završi" ("she wanted to live, and not to end in suicide" 77). She focuses their attention on the future:

Ako je on, ovih dana, bio sasvim klonuo, i misli samo na prošlost, ona nije klonula. Njoj se čini, da su oni, i po godinama svojim sasvim, još, mladi, da se pomire, samo sa prošlošću. Treba se pomiriti, kaže, i sa budućnošću (78).

If he had recently utterly despaired, and thinks only of the past, she did not despair. To her it seemed that, in view

of their years, they were still young to be reconciling themselves with the past only. They should reconcile themselves, she says, with the future too.

Her attitude keeps both of them from sinking into hopelessness. She is prepared to face the changes which time brings in its wake, and encourages her husband:

Niki, - možda će nam ovo proleće, zaista, doneti, neke promene u životu? Možda će se London promeniti, izmeniti prema nama? Možda ćemo se promeniti mi? Život se sastoji iz promena. I sudbina se menja? (79)

Niki - perhaps this spring will really bring some changes into our lives? Perhaps London will change, change towards us? Perhaps we shall change? Life consists of changes. And fate changes.

She remarks that his pessimistic outlook is a result of his assuming that everyone's experience is the same:

Nikolaj, vi prenosite svoje misli u misli drugih u Londonu, a mislite, da su svi bez kuće, bez porodice, bez svoje zemlje, bez smisla u svom životu, zato, što se sve to nama desilo (80).

Nikolaj, you transfer your thoughts on to the thoughts of others in London, and you think that they are all without a home, family, without their own country, with no point to their lives, because that has happened to us.

But Rjepnin continues to be obsessed with the past, and with the heritage it holds.

His state of mind deteriorates rapidly once Nada has left for the United States. He then unconsciously acknowledges the stability which she brought to his life:

Sad će spavati u njenoj postelji, a nje u njoj više nikad neće biti. A njegova postelja neće se više pretvarati u fotelju, svako jutro. Šivačica se tu više neće čuti. A nehotice se osmehnu, i pomisli, da, bez tog zvuka šivačice, više ne može zaspati. Taj ritmički zvuk se, tu, više neće ponoviti (81).

He will now sleep in her bed, and she will never be in it again. And his bed will not be transformed into an armchair again, each morning. Her sewing machine will no longer be heard. And he inadvertently smiled, and thought that without the noise of the sewing machine he would not be able to sleep again. That rhythmic sound will never be repeated *here*..

With her departure Rjepnin foresees the disruption to his day-to-day existence, and the loss of the woman who gave him some sense of past, present and future. He reflects on what the future holds for himself alone, convinced that "neće uspeti, bez nje, ni da išta izmeni u svom životu, i ostaće tako, kao omađijan, samo u prošlosti" ("he will not manage, without her, to change anything in his life, and he will remain, as if under a spell, only in the past" 82).

The threat to the temporal dimension of Rjepnin's being is accompanied after Nađa's departure by a greater intensity in his recollection of the past, his memories forming a parallel time scale alongside the events of 1948. When Nađa leaves for the United States Rjepnin goes with her to the boat, and returns to London by train. He is reluctant to go home immediately to the now empty flat, and notices a cinema billboard near the



station. The cinema is one which shows short films and newsreels, and its board is advertising a film of a parade in Moscow's Red Square. Watching the film Rjepnin is carried away by the sight and sound of the Soviet soldiers marching, with exactly the same step as he used thirty years before. The whole form of the parade is the same as he remembered from his days in the army when he too marched in Red Square:

Sablja je sevnula, isto onako, kao u doba  
kad je i on jahao, u pratnji Brusilova, u  
petom, ili šestom redu, ali prisutan,  
nasmešen i veseo (83).

The sword gleamed, just as in the time  
when he rode in Brusilov's company, in  
the fifth or sixth rank, but present,  
laughing and happy.

By stressing in this episode that the form of the parade is the same as in the past, that the step of the soldiers marching is the same, Rjepnin signals his bridging of the time gap between 1948 and the years before the revolution. The domesticity of the "rhythmic sound" of Nada's sewing machine has been overtaken by the regular beat of marching soldiers. The soldiers gradually evoke in him an image of the old Russia:

Bila je to, sad, ista vojska - kao da je  
vaskrsila stara, ruska, bar se njemu  
činilo (84).

It was now the same army - as if the old  
Russian army was resurrected, at least so  
it seemed to him.

There is a religious intensity in the image of a resurrected Russia which measures the depth of Rjepnin's

feeling as he watches the film. Rjepnin is re-creating the experience of the time when he recognised a purpose in his life, and is turning his back on the present because of its emptiness and lack of purpose.

Watching the film in the year 1948, the prince is actually thinking of events from thirty years before. As he feels that he has lost the rhythm of time passing with Nada's departure, so in the cinema the regular beat of the military march as he sees and hears it on the screen coincides with sights and sounds from thirty years before. The rhythm of life as he lived it all those years before begins to replace the rhythm of life which is slipping out of his grasp in the present. He is facing a breakdown in the temporal order of his personality. This breakdown removes the distinction between past and present. The following chapter is titled "Posle parade na Crvenom trgu" ("After the Parade on Red Square"). The novel continues to follow the prince and at times be narrated by him in London, from May until his suicide in October. "Posle parade na Crvenom trgu" is an ambiguous title because there are two parades, one from thirty years before in which Rjepnin took part, and the one in the newsreel. Given that Rjepnin is at this stage both re-living the past and living in the present the title is a reference to both the parade in his memory and the parade in the newsreel. The text continues to describe his life in

1948 but with a parallel time scale from thirty years before superimposed on the text. Karl Jaspers has commented on the negative aspect of such identification with memory:

If I identified myself with the picture I have of my past, for example, I would lose myself. I would be constructing a schema of my past which I want to be, measuring the present and the future by the standards of my past and depreciating them. I am not what I become, then, but I think I am what I believe I have been - with the result that my very concept of the present and the future will be as if they already were in the past (85).

Following Nada's departure Rjepnin formulates his concept of who he is by the standards of what he has been.

The duality of existence in time, which was explored in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, resurfaces in Roman o Londonu. Following Nada's departure Rjepnin leaves his job with which he was guaranteed accommodation. By chance he meets an old friend, the Pole Ordinski, who offers him his flat as a place to stay while he takes a trip to Poland to see his family. While there Rjepnin comes to the conclusion that his death is the only logical alternative to ending up as a beggar:

Kroz koji dan, krajem septembra, njemu, logično, ostaje da izvrši samo jedno, da učini kraj, i sebi, i svemu, ako neće da završi, bedno, sramno, prosjački, a ta mogućnost je samo: smrt. Smyert' (86).

After a day or two, at the end of September, there remained for him

logically only one thing to do, to put an end to himself and everything, if he was not going to end in poverty, shamefully, as a beggar, and that possibility was only: death. Death.

He arranges his death in such a way as to cover all his tracks. He tells everyone that he is going to Paris, and sends his luggage on to an address there. His arrangements are meticulous, informing the post office of his change of address and expected date of return. He tells Ordinski's maid that he is going on to Algiers from Paris. He checks with the passport office that he will be able to re-enter England after visiting Algiers, where he has a small inheritance to pick up. He leaves a letter for Ordinski in which he tells him that he is going to Paris and then Algiers to join the French Foreign Legion, a long-held desire, but that he is not to inform Nada until he hears from him again (87). His story of joining the Foreign Legion is one of the last acts in his tragi-comic life as an émigré. It symbolises the continuation of the romantic, aristocratic, military values of his life in Russia. Rjepnin chooses a quiet spot on the coast near London, where he pushes off in a boat. Well away from the shore and with his coat weighted with stones, he shoots himself in such a way that his body will fall into the sea and sink.

There are two reasons for his careful planning, one concerning Nada and the reputation that he would bring

on himself, the other is his desire to end his life in his chosen way:

Rjepnin je bio rešen da svoj plan ostvari, pre nego što se Ordinski vrati, sasvim sigurno. Samo doznalo bi se, i to, doznala bi i Nađa brzo, a doznali čak i kad bi, kao ludak, zapalio, nad sobom, kuću, u kojoj je sad stanovao. Čemu to? Bila bi to sramota. Potomak ruskih knjaževa, vojnik, i završio tako sramno. Lepše je nestati na svoju komandu, ali negde, gde njegovu lešinu ne mogu otkriti, a dati neki razlog, za to da misle da je oputovao (88).

Rjepnin was resolved to execute his plan before Ordinski returned, definitely. If people got to know that, then Nađa would quickly find out, and they would find out even if he were to set fire to the roof over his head like a madman. Why go through that? It would be a disgrace. The descendant of Russian princes, a soldier, and to end up so shamed. It is better to disappear at his own command, but somewhere where they cannot find his corpse, and to give some reason so they think he has travelled away.

His death "at his own command" and avoiding shame is his last attempt to act in the manner which he believes is his real self; as a soldier and Russian aristocrat. He kills himself to wipe out all trace of his death, as if he has never been and has stepped outside his being-in-time. He cannot accommodate his image of his self in the present to his image of self in the past. He is living outside the social and historical process of what has made him an émigré, and cannot appropriate the changes which time has brought as part of his personal history.

Rjepnin acting in accordance with his own desire is

a necessary counter to the transience of his life in London. He feels that he has lost control over his own identity, and that his sense of self is constantly being made and unmade for him by others:

Njegovo ogorčenje imalo je za uzrok osećaj: da je sudbina igra, i, da ljudi, pa i žene, svaki čas, pretvaraju, njega, u nekog drugoga, u nekog, koji nije bio, niti je želeo da bude (89).

His bitterness had as its cause the feeling that fate is a game, and that men, and women too, each moment transform him into someone else, into someone who he was not, nor did he want to be.

Rjepnin is trapped in time. He desires to return to the identity that he has of himself in memory, but is aware that the past is irrecoverable. He recognises this tension during his trip to Cornwall, when he is at his most calm and collected. During the journey he reflects once more on the meaning of the past in his life, recognising that what was in the past and what remains in memory are not the same, "Ima neke strašne razlike između te prošlosti, i prošlosti, sad, kakva je u njihovom sećanju" ("There are some terrible differences between the past, and the past now, as it is in their memory" 90). While in Cornwall he visits a place where there is a disused railway station, and sees the past as something that was real but is now irrecoverable:

Zar nije varljivo, bedno, neshvatljivo, i pomisliti, da je sve to, pre sto godina, zaista, bilo novo, i, kao nešto novo i lepo, postojalo? Sad, on to posmatra sa nevericom, a ipak zna da su, tuda,

prolazili ljudi i žene, putnici, putovali i sastajali se bračni parovi i ljubavnici. Roditelji su tu sačekivali decu iz škole. Žene su izlazile pred voz, sa suncobranom u ruci, i kišobranom u ruci, jer u Kornvalu ima mnogo kiše. Živeo je, tu, svakako, i neki garavi ložadž, sa ženom i decom. Kraj kazana iz kojeg izbiја plamen, kao iz pakla. Na tu stanicu se vraćalo i posle pogreba i venčanja, - a odatle, svakako, polazilo i na bračno putovanje?

Sad? Praznina.

Nikakvog traga, - baš nikakvog, - od svega toga.

Prošlo je (91).

Is it not deceptive, miserable, incomprehensible, even to consider that all this was really new one hundred years ago, and as something new and beautiful it existed? Now, he looks at it with disbelief, and nevertheless knows that here passed men and women, travellers, married couples and lovers journeyed and met. Parents waited for their children from school here. Women went out in front of the train, holding a parasol, and an umbrella, since there is a lot of rain in Cornwall. A sooty fireman lived here too with his wife and children. By a boiler from which flames spun, as from Hell. They returned to the station both after funerals and weddings - and from there, they of course went on honeymoon?

Now? Emptiness.

No trace, none at all, of all that.

It has passed.

There are two pasts for Rjepnin, the irrecoverable past and the past as experienced in memory, both of which are preferable to the present. When in London he feels that the present is beyond his control, that he has no identity. There only remains the possibility of entering into the illusion that he can return to what he once was.

Rjepnin and other émigrés like him do not live "po njihovoj volji" ("according to their will") but it depends on people and "od Londona, iz kojeg nema izlaza" ("on London, from which there is no escape" 92). London is an endless circle of people "odlazeći na rad, svako jutro, u vagonima pod zemljom, a vraćajući se, svako večer, u tim istim vagonima kući" ("going to work every morning, in carriages under the ground, and returning every evening in the same carriages home" 93). The city acts on his consciousness and looms in it as a mythic presence. He describes it as a sphinx, and the Thames as the Styx. The city is an archetype threatening his existence, and as an archetype has just one temporal dimension in a mythic time. He admits that the future is open to change, and that he lacks the will to change:

Prošlost, koja se više ne može vratiti.  
Ali bi se budućnost mogla izmeniti. Može  
se, valjda, izmeniti i on, i njegova  
sudbina? Treba imati volju (94).

The past, which can no longer return.  
But the future could be changed.  
Perhaps, even he might be changed, and  
his fate? One needs will.

Rjepnin's present is not identified as the space between past and future, but the point at which being-in-time is suspended between the irrecoverable past, and the illusion of establishing his self outside the historical world. He lacks the will to establish a sense of self in the present.

The tension between illusion and reality is at the



heart of Rjepnin's psychotic disorder, as he considers that "Postoje, dakle, dva sveta, i za njega, - kao svakog, - java i san, ali, šta je jedno, a šta drugo, niko još ne zna. Ni on" ("There exist, then, two worlds for him too, as for everyone, waking and dream, but, which is one and which is the other no-one knows. Not even he" 95). He comes to this conclusion while on the train to Cornwall. The motif of journey, of search, is combined in Roman o Londonu with the motif of the stage set. The whole structure of the novel provides two contexts to Rjepnin's story. He is the character inside a story who is observed by a narrator, and he is also the narrator who witnesses his own fate. The novel has two frames, one is set in the diachronic narration of the third-person narrator. This is the dominant frame. However, the second frame for the work is the one established by Rjepnin himself as the narrator, with synchronic narration. The character becomes the witness to and actor in his own fate. In one episode, the effect achieved by this shift of frame is parodied:

Junak našeg romana onda podseća ženu, da su oni Nelsona čak i videli. Ne živog, razume se, - nego onakvog, kakvog ga je oživeo engleski, filmski, glumac, koji je bio u to vreme, čuven. Leslie Howard. Prilikom neke svečanosti, na stepenicama crkve koja se zove Sveti Pavle, St. Paul's, taj glumac je predstavljao admirala. Da li se seća kako su stajali, kao omađijani? Činilo se da je to, zaista, oživeo Nelson (96).

The hero of our novel then reminds his wife that they have even seen Nelson.

Not alive - of course - but as brought to life by an English film actor who was famous at the time. Leslie Howard. On the occasion of some ceremony, on the steps of the church which is called St Paul's, the actor was representing the admiral. Does she remember how they stood, as if bewitched? It seemed that it was really Nelson brought to life.

The effect created by the actor's stepping off the screen and portraying Nelson in the street breaks the barrier between illusion and reality, reinforcing the presence of the illusion as real. Similarly, Rjepnin's movement from one frame to another resolves the tension between illusion and reality. Rjepnin shifts into the frame of an actor, and "radio je svoj posao kao da je u nekom pozorištu, glumac" ("he did his job as if he were in a theatre, an actor" 97). And when he dies, he is to die not as a real person but as if on stage, on which "treba samo stati i pucati mirno, kao što glumci pucaju" ("he only has to stand and fire calmly, as actors fire" 98). In his essay on Roman o Londonu Puvačić remarks on the "često korišćenje pozorišne terminologije" ("frequent use of theatrical terminology" 99) as a feature which stresses Rjepnin's alienation. The tension between the past in memory and the past as it really was, irrecoverable, is resolved when Rjepnin steps entirely into the symbolic frame of the theatre. In this theatrical frame, Rjepnin's suicide is a symbolic death of a self which he does not recognise, and the appropriation of an image of self from memory.

Rjepnin considers returning to Russia, but he is sure that the émigré community in London will then present him as a spy to the Soviet embassy (100). The voice of his dead friend Barlov exhorts him to return speaking in a mixture of French and Russian, with a military command:

Tako, tako, très bien, très bien, mon prince! Shagom marsh. Marsh. Domoï! Domoï! Mi se vraćamo. Svi se vraćamo (101).

That's it, that's it, très bien, très bien, mon prince! Quick march. March. Home! Home! We are returning. We are all returning!.

He again hears Barlov's voice in the final pages of the novel, when Barlov suggests death as a necessary pre-requisite for the return to an irrecoverable past:

U glavi je, opet, iznenada, čuo, tihi smeh, i šapat, pokojnoga Barlova. Neka idu bez traga, knjaz, svi to, sa njihovim tražanjem napretka čovečanstva, i bolje Rusije! Mi se, posle naše smrti, vraćamo (sic). Shagom marsh, knjaz'! Tako, tako, svi se, tamo, vraćamo (102).

In his head he again heard suddenly the quiet laugh and whisper of the late Barlov. Let them go without trace, prince, all those with their search for the progress of mankind and a better Russia! We are returning after our death. Quick march, prince! That's it, that's it, we are all returning there.

Rjepnin settles his affairs in London calmly "jer se vraća u godine kad je bio junker" ("for he is returning to the years when he was a cadet" 103). Death is the logical answer. The return which he desires is a return

to a past which is irrecoverable. The manner of his suicide is a symbolic gesture to remove all trace of himself, to escape the oppressive present, and step outside time.

The manner of Rjepnin's suicide reveals his search for a return to the past of his ideal values, associated with childhood and his origin as a Russian. The past which he re-creates becomes more compelling than the doubts of whether it is the true past. Death is the only alternative for the being-in-time which he has adopted, outside history and the present. His search leads him to a suicide which is redolent with images of baptism, and total immersion in water. His death is the symbol of a new beginning, an end to natural life which is the necessary precursor to life as an illusion. The final sentence of the novel records that while no-one knows of his final action, the light of the lighthouse shines like a star. The star is the biblical symbol of the new-born, yet here is only like a star:

Samo je sa svetionika, na visini te velike stene, kojom se park završavao, treperila jedna svetlost, cele noći, trepetom, kao da, tu, zemlja pokazuje neku zvezdu (104).

Only from the lighthouse, on the top of the high cliff, at which the park ended, flickered a light, with a glimmer as if, here, the earth reveals a star.

The link between the earth and the false star is the final testimony of the transformation of his material conditions into an existential issue of his

being-in-time.

Both Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću and Roman o Londonu express non-linear versions of time, in which time is expressed as it is felt and experienced by the characters. The diarist of the first novel exists at a point between memory and dream. Milošević describes the whole novel as closed;

Čarnojevićeva avantura opisuje zatvoren krug. Na njenom početku je jednoličnost i besmislenost postajanja i ista ta jednoličnost i besmislenost je i na kraju svih putovanja (105).

Čarnojević's adventure describes a closed circle. At its inception is the monotony and senselessness of existence, and that same monotony and senselessness is at the end of all his journeys.

However, there is the suggestion of a limited salvation at the end. Time, like the diarist, is at a point between the intransient moment personified by *the sailor*, and the irrecoverable past personified by Rajić. In Roman o Londonu, Rjepnin expresses his desire for a return to the past. This return can only be accomplished through death, and his suicide presents a symbolic vision of rebirth. But, as a symbol it is not a solution to the existential crisis faced by Rjepnin. The very different portrayals of being-in-time in Crnjanski's first and last novels present time as a medium through which consciousness becomes aware of self, and in which memory, will, and desire become

## CHAPTER FIVE

temporal concepts. They interweave one into the other, and together present a point at which his characters struggle for a definition of self. Against this backcloth, salvation for Crnjanski's characters is limited, tenuous, and only ever potential.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Notes

1. Leslie A. Johnson, The Experience of Time in Crime and Punishment, Slavica, Columbus, 1985, p10.
2. II, p56.
3. III, pp25-26.
4. III, p128.
5. IV, p262.
6. IX, p52.
7. II, p49.
8. II, p50. This section on Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću is a revised version of the article "Time in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću: Structural and Thematic Features", Relations, 1985, 3, pp67-76; 4, pp55-63.
9. II, p70.
10. II, p7.
11. II, p8.
12. II, p9.
13. II, p11.
14. II, p11.
15. II, p14.
16. II, p7.
17. II, p23.
18. II, p25.
19. Henri Bergson, Matter and Memory, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1919, p171.
20. II, p67.
21. II, p68.
22. II, p82.
23. II, p68.
24. II, pp54-55.

## CHAPTER FIVE

25. II, p50.
26. II, p50.
27. II, p52.
28. II, p61, p62, p63.
29. II, p54.
30. II, p54.
31. II, p50.
32. II, p53.
33. II, p88.
34. II, p44.
35. II, p72.
36. II, p79.
37. II, pp56-57.
38. II, p61.
39. II, p25.
40. II, p60.
41. II, p62.
42. Henri Bergson, Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness, Swan Sonnenschein, London, 1910, p100.
43. II, p53.
44. II, p89.
45. Henri Bergson, Matter and Memory, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1919, p162.
46. Paul de Man, "The Rhetoric of Temporality", Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism, Methuen, London, 1983, p208.
47. Frederich Nietzsche, "The Use and Abuse of History", The Complete Works, edited by Dr Oscar Levy, vol 5, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1927, p6.



## CHAPTER FIVE

48. II, p11.
49. II, p66, p70.
50. II, p74, p80, p89.
51. II, p82.
52. Milan Dedinac, "Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću od Miloša Crnjanskog", Putevi, 1922, 1, p30.
53. Radomir Konstantinović, "Poetski humor Crnjanskog. Povodom Seoba i Dnevnika o Čarnojeviću u izdanju Minerve 1956", Književne novine, 22 July 1956, p5.
54. John G. Gunnell, Political Philosophy and Time, Wesleyan University Press, 1968, p23.
55. II, p90.
56. I, p152.
57. Mirjana Popović-Radović, "Iz građe za Roman o Londonu: Avetinjski pisac romana u Londonu", Delo, 1984, XXX, 3, pp79-104.
58. Vladimir Bunjac, Kamenovani Crnjanski, Milan Rakić, Valjevo, 1986, p183.
59. VIII, p49.
60. VIII, p40.
61. VIII, p40.
62. VIII, p41.
63. VIII, p118.
64. VIII, p51.
65. VIII, p55.
66. VIII, p37.
67. VIII, p10.
68. VIII, p133.
69. see VIII, p214.
70. VIII, p134.
71. VIII, p135.

## CHAPTER FIVE

72. VIII, p135.
73. VIII, p135.
74. VIII, p137.
75. IX, p52.
76. VIII, p83.
77. VIII, p60.
78. VIII, p69.
79. VIII, p71.
80. VIII, p172.
81. IX, p190.
82. IX, p191.
83. IX, p188.
84. IX, p189.
85. Karl Jaspers, Philosophy, vol 2, University of Chicago Press, 1970, p31.
86. IX, p322.
87. see IX, pp333-336.
88. IX, p331.
89. IX, p339.
90. VIII, p252.
91. VIII, p303.
92. IX, p9.
93. IX, p58.
94. IX, p194.
95. VIII, p253.
96. VIII, p160.
97. IX, p250.

98. IX, p325.

99. Dušan Puvačić, "Izgnanik ili problem samoće u Romanu o Londonu", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, p278.

100. IX, p304.

101. IX, p83.

102. IX, p355.

103. IX, p333.

104. IX, p358.

105. Nikola Milošević, Roman Miloša Crnjanskog: Problem univerzalnog iskaza, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1970, pp93-94.

CHAPTER SIX

TIME AND HISTORY

Seobe

In the previous chapter we examined the first and last of Crnjanski's novels and established time as the medium through which consciousness becomes aware of self. However, the characters of these novels are also viewed against the background of the social and historical world. In Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću the First World War has a profound influence on the consciousness of the diarist, and in Roman o Londonu Rjepnin's life in emigration is the result of the Russian Revolution. The interaction between the characters and the social world is more prominent in the two novels Seobe and Druga knjiga seoba. The social world constitutes the institutions of family, nation, and state, to which the characters belong, and with which they may find themselves in conflict. Such institutions mediate between characters and the wider flow of events in history. The emphasis in Seobe and Druga knjiga seoba continues to fall on the characters, but in these novels questions of identity and self are considered in relation to the social world. The issue for the characters is to retain their sense of self and

being-in-time within the institutional framework of the social world. Ultimately, the issue is to impose some degree of self on history.

In Seobe Vuk Isaković's memory of his father and the influence which he exerted on his life are instrumental in shaping who he is and his actions in the present tense of the novel:

Odrastao uz oca koji je još Savojskom prodavao stoku i koji je svu svoju decu, braću, rodbinu, i sva svoja kumstva i poznanstva terao u austrijsku vojsku koja je potiskivala Turke, imao je u mladosti čak i lep život u toj vojsci. Mažen i često nagrađen, on je nosio u sebi neki maglovit, ali dubok pojam sreće i zadovoljstva, u nadi da će se sve to ratovanje svršiti nekim opštim mirom, u kom će i on i njegovi srodnici i poznanici, i svi njegovi vojnici biti odeveni u neko naročito svečano i gizdavo odelo, pa će tako, u krug, obići ratište i carevinu, na vidik celome svetu, koji će uzviknuti: gle, Srbi! (1).

Brought up by his father, who continued to sell cattle to Savoy, and who pushed all his children, brothers, relatives, all those closely tied to his family, and acquaintances into the Austrian army which was holding back the Turks, he had in his youth even a nice life in the army. Flattered and frequently decorated, he carried in him a vague, but deep sense of happiness and satisfaction, in the hope that the warring would end in a general peace, in which he and his relatives and friends, and all his soldiers would be dressed in some special ceremonial and bright uniform, and then parade around the battlefield and the empire, in full view of the world, who would exclaim: look, the Serbs!

Vuk pursued his career in the army for the greater glory of the Serbian nation. His sense of family and his

sense of nationhood are closely intertwined. He maintained his hope during the three wars in which he fought for the Austrians against the Turks, under the influence of his father's promise that the Serbs would return and liberate their land from the Turks:

Pod uticajem očevih obećanja, koji mu je punio glavu o povratku u popaljenu i poklanu, opustelu Serbiu, on je u vojsci živeo ne samo u miru, već i u sva tri svoja rata, bezbrižno i zadovoljno, očekujući jednako nešto prijatno što će svima njima da se dogodi (2).

Under the influence of his father's promises, which filled his head with ideas about returning to pillaged, ~~slaughtered~~, and deserted Serbia, he lived in the army not only at peace, but in all three wars carefree and satisfied, constantly expecting something pleasant to happen to all of them.

It was only after his father's death that Vuk began to notice the other side of life for the Serbs. His success in the army made him trusted by the authorities and he was frequently called on by them to help relocate the Serbs settling in the Empire to escape the Turkish domination of the south:

Tek posle očeve smrti, zapadajući sve dublje u taj vojnički život, naseljavanja, popisivanja, gomilanja ljudi i stoke, po tvrđavama i vojnički raspoređenim selima, Isaković oseti da ništa bolje ne biva i tek tada primeti oko sebe blatišta i baruština, bedu svojih ljudi, život, svaki dan isti čemerni život, u selima i šančevima, po kućama na vodi, po kolibama i oborima, porupama iskopanim u zemlji (3).

Only after his father's death, falling deeper into that military life of settlements, census, crowds of people and

cattle, around the fortresses and the military villages, Isaković felt that there was nothing better, and only then did he notice the mud and the swamps, the poverty of his men, life, every day the same miserable life, in the villages and the trenches, in the houses by the water, in the huts and outbuildings, in the holes dug into the ground.

Vuk set off for this his fourth war for the Austrians with a sense of foreboding, but with the faint hope "da će se nešto najposle svršiti i ispuniti" ("that something would be finally finished and fulfilled" 4).

The importance of the family, and particularly the figure of the father, is important in the shaping of all Crnjanski's characters. Čarnojević's father in

Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću dies while he is still young,

and his mother dies on his return from war, when he is not permitted to see her (5). Čarnojević's name is

introduced through a reference to his father Egon Čarnojević (6). The diarist also states with reference

to Maca, that "nismo imali dece" (we did not have any children" 7), while with reference to Čarnojević he

states that "jednog dana doznao je da ima sina" ("one day he was told that he had a son" 8). In Roman o

Londonu, Rjepnin often recalls his father, the

anglophile member of the pre-revolutionary Duma who

injected into his son admiration for the achievements of English liberalism (9). Things could have turned out

differently for him and Nada if they had children (10),

and when Nada leaves for the United States she is

pregnant, although her husband does not know.

Pavle Isaković, in Druga knjiga seoba, is the adopted son of Vuk, and it is he who fulfils the ambition of emigrating to Russia with his cousins and their families. For this reason, the Austrian authorities direct their attention at Pavle since "adoptiran, Pavel je tobože bio duple Isaković i naročito ga treba pomilovati, ako je to moguće" ("adopted, Pavle was ostensibly twice an Isaković, and they would have to appease him in particular, if that was possible" 11). "Pavel" is a slaveno-serbski form of his name. Slaveno-serbski was the liturgical language of the Serbian Orthodox Church <sup>in Vojvodina</sup>. Pavle and his dead wife did not have children, and he is resigned never to have children:

U jednom svom pismu, Pavle je pisao, Isaku Isakoviću, da starog poodima njihovog, Vuka, Isakovića, treba zavaravati, reći mu da će se Pavle, u Rosiji, oženiti, i familiju nastaviti, ali da je istina da on, Pavle, na to, više, ne misli (12).

In one of his letters to Isak Isaković, Pavle wrote that he would have to deceive their old step-father, Vuk Isaković, tell him that Pavle will marry in Russia and carry on the family name, but that truthfully he, Pavle, no longer thinks of it.

Vuk had two daughters with Dafina, whereas Pavle is an adopted son. This relationship is in itself a subversive twist to the epic voice and moral code which is one of the features of the novel. Bakhtin points to



trend in the epic in which the family and the nation are intertwined:

The world of the epic is the national heroic past: it is a world of "beginnings" and "peak times" in the national history, a world of fathers and of founders of families, a world of "firsts" and "bests" (13).

Pavle is not Vuk's son by blood, although his foster father promised him that there was a glorious future for him, for their family, and for the nation in Russia. As with Vuk himself, the promise of the father is unfulfilled and in the end empty.

It is interesting to note that Crnjanski himself and his wife Vida had no children, although there is no evidence to indicate how the couple felt about this. Crnjanski's own father died while he was still young, which he recalls in a poignant matter-of-fact tone in Itaka i komentari. "Umro je idućeg dana. Nije dozvolio da me pozovu iz Temišvara, sa škola" ("He died the next day. He did not let them call me from Temišvar, from school" 14). He died in Ilandža, while Crnjanski was at school in Temišvar.

Vuk's father is an important figure in his life. He would always mention his name "pri svakoj važnijoj izreci" ("at every more important statement" 15). Vuk's memories of his father provide a base on which he has built his view of himself in relation to the times in which he lives, and the future. The present is a struggle to defeat the Turks, the reward for which is

his father's promise that the nation will then return to Serbia. Vuk's view of history is monumental, in Nietzschean terms. Nietzsche describes an individual who holds such a view as one whose "goal is happiness, not perhaps his own, but often the nation's or humanity's at large" (16). For Vuk history is a string of great deeds across the centuries, and his anticipated reward is fame and a place in that history. Vuk's father is the source of authority which has guided his search for happiness and fulfillment, and which links him to the wider flow of historical events. However, from the following comment it is clear that the course of history has begun to change, "Bilo je jasno da se vremena turskih ratova više neće vratiti" ("It was clear that the times of the Turkish wars would not return" 17), leaving Vuk to live "po tuđoj volji" ("according to someone else's will" 18). Vuk's sense of living according to his own will is destroyed when his father's promise is no longer possible.

The promise of an eventual return gave Vuk reason for living the life of a soldier on the frontier with Serbia, ruled by a foreign power. The promise of the father takes on an ontological significance. Vuk is prepared to fight for the Austrians, on the assumption that the freedom of Serbia will be the end result. The present, that which is being lived, will have its justification in relation to its end. When the desired

future becomes present, the happiness for which Vuk is searching will become present. The origin of his sense of history, which binds Vuk to the community of family and nation, is to be found in the promise of his father. In this way, Vuk's sense of self in history is characterised by what Tobin terms the "genealogical imperative" in her book Time and the Novel (19).

Tobin uses the term to describe those novels which achieve a narrative unity by following the events surrounding the life of a family or its progress over the generations. In the case of Seobe, the term can be used in a narrower sense. Vuk's sense of self in time and history will be completed when he fulfils the promise of the father, and thus assumes for himself the authority of the father.

When the promise is broken, so are the bonds which bind Vuk to family and nation. His fighting for the will of others increases his sense of separation from his wife and children, and he questions "zar nije pripadao drugome, a ne toj ženi, ni toj deci što su za njim plakala" ("did he not really belong to another, and not to that wife, nor those children who wept after him" 20). The people left behind in his village are cut off from the events and experiences of Vuk and his soldiers:

Pre, kada su<sup>se</sup> klali sa Turcima, videli su zapaljenu selu, turske lađe, pune roblja, na vodi, kako prolaze, čuli su da gore manastiri, da siluju žene i bacaju uvis decu, pa ih dočekuju na noževe, a sad od svega toga ne beše ni glasa (21).

Before, when they fought with the Turks, they would see villages put to the torch, Turkish boats sail by laden with slaves on the water, they would hear of monasteries burning, of women raped, of children tossed into the air and caught on knives, and now of all that there was not a word.

The community no longer participates in the history of the nation. Vuk is distanced from family, community, nation, and the historical process of his own times.

Vuk's view of his past, present, and future, changes under the influence of new historical circumstances. Now the past constantly disappears from consciousness when he goes to war, and when he returns, "kao i da nije bilo" ("as if it had never even been" 22). The future looks very uncertain for his men and their nation in Austria:

Isaković je, osim toga, približavajući se, po četvrti put, bojištu, slutio da nikad bolje biti neće i da će ih podeliti i kod kuće, na domu, razdelivši ih spahijama i gradovima kao roblje, kao sluge, kao paore. Neće im dati da ostanu vojnici, neće da im dati ni da imaju svoje crkve, kao što im ne daju da svoj kraj nazivaju Novom Serbiom (23).

Moreover, Isaković, approaching the battlefield for the fourth time, felt that life would never get better and that they will be separated at home, dispersed to the landowners and towns like goods, like servants, like serfs. They will not allow them to remain soldiers, they will not allow them even to have their own churches, as they will not allow them to call their land New Serbia.

The conditions under which he is living at the moment,

the loss of the father's original promise, and the bleak future, leads him to see everything, past, present, and future as empty and meaningless. In camp at Strasbourg, in a lull in the fighting, Vuk reflects, and most intensively expresses his emotions in the repetitions of the emptiness which he feels all around. At Strasbourg "oseti najposle tu groznu, vrtoglavu prazninu pred sobom, u kojoj više nema ničega" ("he felt finally that terrible, dizzy emptiness in front of him, in which there is no longer anything"). He could only see "bezdano ništavilo i prazninu" ("endless nothingness and emptiness"). He had to return home "sa svojim životom ludim i praznim i ništavim" ("with his mad and empty and worthless life"). His reflections on his life finally merge with his surroundings as he feels that "u tamu i bezmernu prazninu utonu mu to veće ne samo ta njegova koliba u kojoj ležao, nego i sav život" ("not only that hut in which he was lying but also his whole life sank that evening into darkness and an endless emptiness" 24). Such links between Vuk's psychological torment and historical fate are described by Milošević as a reflection of the "uzajamna uslovljenost aksiološke i psihološko-istorijske dimenzija lika glavnog junaka" ("mutual determination of the axiological and psychological-historical dimensions of the character of the main hero" 25).

The idea of return is an important part of the

journey motif in the imagery of the novel, expressing the links between self, history, and time. Vuk and his men, in their alienation from home and their historic mission to liberate Serbia, fear that they will not return home. "Natrag, nisu verovali da će se ikad vratiti" ("They did not believe that they would ever return back" 26). Their feelings of hopelessness are mingled with imagery of the surrounding landscapes which reflects their isolation from past and community, expressed in such sentences as, "Kao i magle što su lebdele nisko, nad poljanama i nestajale iza njih, raskidaše se, u njihovim mislima, i slike njihovih žena i dece" ("Like the mists which hovered below, above the fields and disappeared beyond them, images of their wives and children dispersed in their thoughts" 27). Nature becomes a site which both reflects and challenges their inner moods:

Velike promene na nebesima dešavahu se pred njima; duž reke se produžiše guste šume, u kojima su lomili žbunje i rili po kišnici divlji veprovi; kopci kružahu nad njihovim glavama i ispraćahu ih do podnožja brda, na koja počеше da se, iznemogli, uspinju (28).

Great changes occurred in the skies before them; along the river thick forests stretched, in which wild boar broke through bushes and burrowed in the drizzle; <sup>sparrow-hawks</sup> circled over their heads and followed them to the foothills which they began, exhausted, to climb.

Vuk and his men feel "u duši" ("in their souls") the "praznina" ("emptiness" 29) which is expressed through

their contact with nature. As Vučković remarks, "pejzaž, čovek i istorija" ("landscape, man and history" 30) are three significant elements in the construction of this novel. Vuk's feelings of isolation from the outside world, from the community left at home, from the past and future, and the inner turmoil which he is experiencing, lead him to consider that on this campaign he will die. His premonition is expressed many times, for example, "naslutivši, ovoga puta, svoju smrt" ("having sensed, this time, his death" 31), and later:

Polazeći u ovaj rat, četvrti put u svom životu, viđajući smrt, on se nadaše pri polasku da će se nešto najposle svršiti i ispuniti, što se eto nikada ne svršava (32).

Setting off for war, the fourth time in his life, seeing death, he hoped from the start that something would at last be completed and achieved, which was not done before.

The premonition of death becomes more significant when the thought that he will not return home, becomes a desire not to return:

Tad, kao i njegovim ljudima, prvi put mu dođe misao i neka nejasna žudnja da se više ne vrati. Uz slutnju smrti koju je osetio sada prvi put i koju na svojim odlascima u rat, do sada, nikad, nije osećao, pridruži mu se i ona neprestana dosada, koju je već dobro znao, što ga je pratila, uvek, do prvih bitaka (33).

Then, as well as to his men, for the first time the thought occurred to him and some unclear longing that he would no longer return. Alongside this foreboding of death which he now felt for the first time and which he had never felt before with his departure to war, he was joined

by that constant <sup>boredom</sup> which he already knew well, which always followed him to the first battles.

Vuk's sense of who he is in relation to the community, who he was, and his hopes for the future have to be re-established in the light of the broken promise which his father made to him. A part of him has to die in order to retrieve his sense of purpose in the social world, and he cannot return the same as he left. In Roman o Londonu, Rjepnin returns through death to the memory of his self. In Seobe, Vuk searches for salvation to compensate for the loss of his father's promise, and to return to his self the authority of the father.

No matter how discouraged he feels, there is a voice within which encourages him:

Prazno je dakle bilo, pred njim, zanavek, i uzaludno, za njim, sve što beše prošlo. Ništa nije postigao, ni u ovom ratu, kao ni ostali, i sve to njegovo hodanje i seljakanje samo se jednako nastavljao. Do dna međutim, u sebi, osećao je da je nemoguće da sve to tako prođe, i kako ga vuče glas neki, u njemu, obećavajući mu nešto vanredno, pri svršetku (34).

So it was empty before him, forever, and in vain behind him everything which had passed. He had accomplished nothing, not in this war just as the others had not. And all his marching and moving just kept on continuing. However, at bottom he felt in himself that it was impossible for everything to pass like this, and how some inner voice drags him along, promising him something wonderful at the end.

The voice which promises is a remnant of his past and



his father. However, the original promise was based on a course of history which is now closed. Vuk is at the crossroads where his sense of being-in-time is to be re-established. He is searching for a new origin and the offer of a new salvation from the problems and pain of living in the present, which he finds in his vision of the star and of Russia:

Od sveg života, razmišljajući, ostadoše mu svetle u pameti i sad, samo one sjajne, čiste zvezde, i srebrne, šumske putanje nad kojima se spušta aprilska magla, kojima je projahao u prve dane svoga braka sa ženom, živeći u onoj jednolikoj dosadi male slavonske posade, loveći lisice, a u budućnosti, samo ta bezgranična, zavejana Rusija, kuda mišljaše da se odseli, da bi jednom lakše živeo i da bi se već jednom odmorio i smirio (35).

Of all his life, on reflection, there remained in his memory even now bright, only those shining, pure stars, and the silver, forest paths over which the April mist swirled lower, along which he rode with his wife in the first days of marriage, living in the monotonous drudgery of a small Slavonian garrison, hunting foxes, and in the future, only that endless, snow-covered Russia, where he thought to emigrate, so that for once he could live easily and rest and be at peace.

Russia is never considered as a geographic entity by Vuk, but as a symbol presented in association with

"izrazi kao što su 'bezgranična' i 'zavejana'"

("expressions such as 'endless' and 'snow-covered' 36).

It is a symbol of salvation. His dream of emigrating to Russia is in response to the Austrian threat against Serbian national identity, compensates for the different

historical circumstances in which a return to Serbia is impossible. In Russia he sees the possibility of preserving those elements of Serbdom which bind the community and nation together, and in which he will be able to re-establish his purpose in life. He is creating a different historical model, based on a different promise, which will also never be fulfilled. On the other hand, it offers him a return to, and a reformulation of, something which he can regard as the essence of his being. He lives in a dialectic between his sense of being-in-time and history, which has been accommodated to the new symbols of Russia and the star.

Vuk is only at ease with himself when the present tense of his living is reflected in such symbols. The more striking symbol of Isaković's ideal is the star. It appears as the chapter heading for both the first and last chapters "Beskrajni, plavi krug. U njemu, zvezda" ("An infinite blue circle. In it, a star" 37), which is repeated in the first chapter as Vuk wakes:

Tada, pomućenom svešču, prvo začuje lavež  
pasa i poj petlova, da odmah zatim širom,  
u mraku, otvori oči i ne vidi ništa, ali  
da mu se učini kao da vidi, u visini,  
beskrajan, plavi krug. I, u njemu,  
zve<sup>č</sup>du (38).

Then, in his disturbed consciousness, he first heard the barking of the dogs and the crowing of the cocks, then immediately he opened his eyes wide in the darkness and saw nothing, but it seemed to him as if he could see, high above, an infinite, blue circle. And, in it, a star.

In Pécs, Vuk is invited to the bishop's house where, depressed and downcast, he comments drunkenly that "živimo uzalud" ("we live in vain" 39). The bishop points out into the night, to the landscape in the moonlight and asks if all that is "praznina" ("emptiness" 40). Vuk responds:

Tada čestnjejši Isakovič poče buditi  
Komesara i, već sasvim napit, blenu u  
noć, punu zvezda, prešav pogledom sva  
mesečinom obasjana polja... sve šume u  
daljini... brda... i oblake... pa, unevši  
se biskupu u lice, prošaputa... "tamo az  
pojdu..." i zaplaka (41).

Then the honourable Isakovič began to wake the regional commander and, already well drunk, stared into the night, full of stars, having passed his gaze over the fields bathed in moonlight... all the forests in the distance... the hills... and the clouds... and, thrusting his face towards the bishop, he whispered, "There I am going" and burst into tears.

The image of the star continues to illuminate Vuk's lighter moments, as a symbol to counter the emptiness which dominates much of his time (42).

The image of the star and of Russia as the ideal place to live has to be seen in the context of Vuk's desire to establish a present in which he will be able to live "po svojoj volji" ("according to his own will"), and where past, present, and future will then form a coherent unity:

Lak život, vedrina, događaji što se  
slivaju kao čisti i hladni, prijatni,  
penušavi slapovi, moraju biti negde i za  
njih dostižni. Odseliti se treba zato,  
otići nekuda, smiriti se negde na nečem  
čistom, bistrom, glatkom kao površina

dubokih, gorskih jezera, mišljaše, dok je oznojen ležao kraj svojih pasa, koji su dahćući hvatali muve, ispruženi po slami. Otići sa ostalima, i sa patrijarhom, iz onoga blata, iz neprekidnih ratova, službi i obaveza. Živeti po svojoj volji, bez ove strašne zbrke, idući za svojim životom, za koji se i rodio. Idući nečem vanrednom, što je kao nebo osećao da sve pokriva i završava. Tako da mu se sve što je dosad činio, ne čini ludo i uzaludno, a budućnost da mu bude shvatljiva i u njoj da se ovo prazno, grozno čekanje na mir jednako ne produžava (43).

An easy life, serenity, events which flow together like pure and cold, pleasant, foamy waterfalls must be accessible for them too. Therefore they ought to emigrate, to go away somewhere, to settle somewhere on something pure, bright, smooth as the surface of deep mountain lakes, he thought, while he lay sweating beside his dogs, who were panting and catching flies stretched out in the straw. To go away with the rest, and with the patriarch, from that mud, from the incessant wars, service and obligations. To live according to one's own will, without this terrible confusion, to follow one's own life, for which one is born. Going to something wonderful, which he felt covers and completes everything, like the sky. So everything which he has done until now does not seem crazy and in vain, and the future will be comprehensible and there this empty, terrible waiting for peace will not stretch out forever.

The place of which he dreams is a vision of an integral unity in which he and nature are linked in organic harmony, evocative of the drive for simultaneity in Crnjanski's sumatraism. However, the harmony rests upon the ability to live according to his will, to exert a sense of self on the world outside and on history. The transcendental moment is linked to an ontological

search.

The final passage of the novel brings together in one paragraph the images of the star and Russia, the links between his youth and old age, and the genealogical imperative:

I dok mu se, u duši, kao u beskrajnom krugu, jednako ponavljahu misli o odlasku, o odlasku nekud, u Rusiju, nad kojom se u očajanju, iznemogao, posle toliko meseci tumananja, i patnje bio nadneo, dotle mu je, zaspalom prvi put opet kod kuće, u telu drhtalo, kao neka zvezda, poslednje zrno nekadanje mladosti. Ono ga je zadržavalo očajnog, zamuklog, suludog već od patnje i tuge, među tim baruštinama i vodama, što se isparavahu nad zemljom, koju je od milošte zvao Novom Serbiom. Zrno, što je i u njegovoj starosti sačuvalo u sebi moć da proklija i nadnese nova bića nad vremena i nebesa, koja će se ogledati u vodama što se slivaju i sastaju, tu ispod Turske i Nemačke, ogledati i nadnositi kao mostovi (44).

And while these thoughts were repeated in his soul, as in an infinite circle, thoughts about departure, about departure somewhere in Russia, which he had turned over in his mind, desperate and exhausted after so many months of wandering and suffering, until his first night at home again when the last kernel of his erstwhile youth had stirred in his body like some star. It kept him desperate, silent, foolish from suffering and sadness amongst the marshes and creeks which released their vapours over the land which he called New Serbia out of love. The seed, which preserved in his old age the power in him to germinate and place new beings over the times and skies, which will be mirrored in the waters which flow and meet here between Turkey and Germany, mirror and span like bridges.

Vuk has re-established the links between self and time, and self and history, in the power to become himself the

father. His return home is the return to continue the promise of the father. The substance of his father's promise has changed according to the demands of historical circumstances. The star, Russia, and the genealogical imperative, offer new symbols for Vuk's being-in-time. In some senses Vuk and Arandel are similar in their desire to create a coherency of time and their being-in-time, and alike in their power to do so which is denied to Dafina.

Arandel is Vuk's brother, and the two of them are united by what Milošević sees as the parallels between them (45). Petković sees the physical parallels between them as part of the wider composition of the novel (46). They are opposites in many respects; Vuk is heavily built and a leader of the Serbian community, while Arandel is lean and a merchant whose life is dedicated to earning money. Arandel is younger than Vuk, but behaves towards him as if he were the older of the two. Unlike Vuk, he did not have great respect for his father, and was "u neprekidnoj svađi" ("in constant argument" 47) with both of them. He did not share their dream for the future return to Serbia:

U neprekidnom seljakanju, još za života očevog, mučeći se sa svojim obesnim bratom, Arandelu Isakoviču činio se život njegove porodice i rodbine, pa i tog ostalog sveta što se beše sa njima doselio iz Srbije, i selio opet natrag u Serbiu, sasvim ludilo. Videvši oko sebe, svud, baruštine i blato, ljude što su se ukopavali u zemlju i živeli po zemunicama, da bi se u proleće, ili pred

snegom, opet doselili dalje. Arandel Isaković osetio je divlju potrebu da svemu tome stane na put, da se negde zadrži, i da i druge prisili da stanu (48).

In their incessant moving, still during his father's lifetime, having a difficult time with his <sup>Yakish</sup> brother, to Arandel Isaković the life of his family and his relatives, and even the whole of that world which had come with them from Serbia, and was moving back to Serbia, seemed madness. Seeing around himself, everywhere, swamps and mud, people digging themselves into the earth and living in dugouts, only in spring or before the snow to move on further again, Arandel Isaković felt a wild need to put an end to all of that, to stop somewhere, and to force others to stop.

He found his vocation in trade which gave him an advantage over the other members of his family, and all others with whom he came into contact:

Promene predela, kuća i lica, ljudi, sa kojima je sretao, načiniše ga samopouzdanim i oholim, jer on, žut, crn, sa svojim suvim rukama, iako slabiji od njih, nije se menjao i ostajao je isti (49).

The changes in scenery, houses and faces, people, with whom he met, made him self-confident and aloof, for he, yellow, black, with his thin hands, although weaker than them, did not change and remained the same.

He derives his feeling of superiority from the power of his money. War and the movement of whole communities brings only disruption to his aims:

Moć neku natprirodnu osetio je u svojim talirima, jer gde je njih istresao iz kese, tu su zastajale lađe i kuće su postajale nepomične i njegove. Kretahu se po njegovoj želji i njegovim zamislima i uskoro mu se činilo da i kiše na njih

padaju, i proleća oko njih nastaju, kad on hoće i kako on hoće (50).

He felt a supernatural power in his thalers, since where he shook out his purse, there boats stopped and houses became immovable and his. They moved according to his will and his plans and soon it seemed to him that the rains fell on them, and that springs rose around them, when he wanted and how he wanted.

Arandel is able to command the world around him by buying it, he exerts his will over the present tense in which he lives, and to himself imagines that he is able to control nature. Arandel is able to exert a sense of his self on events around him. His desire for Dafina is a desire to possess. He watches and weighs her movements in his house and "kao dobar trgovac, video je o čemu se radi" ("like a good merchant, he saw what was going on" 51).

Arandel is very different from Vuk. He has never held any regard for his father, for the community, and for the future of the nation. He enters into history as a merchant, with the desire to possess. However, as with Vuk whose sense of self in history is shattered when his father's promise is taken away, Arandel also changes when his feelings towards Dafina change:

Verovao je da će, ovoga puta, doživeti nešto što one druge nisu mogle da mu dadu i verovao je da mora postojati u njegovom životu neko doba u kom će mu biti prijatno i dobro, lako, kao na nebesima, kao što je njegov brat Vuk verovao da mora negde biti neka dobra i krasna zemlja, kuda svi treba da se isele (52).

He believed that this time he would



experience something which those other women could not give him and he believed that there must exist in his life some period which would be pleasant and good, easy, as it is in heaven, as his brother believed that there must be some good and beautiful land where they should all migrate.

Arandel begins to look at the future in a way which corresponds to Vuk's vision of Russia. His desire for his sister-in-law deprives him of the self-assured tranquillity with which he approached his life in the past:

To što je sve tako nepredviđeno došlo, poražavalo ga je i gušilo. Na drugi način i oštrije, nego njegov brat, Arandel Isaković osećao je užas, grozan užas što je oko njih sve tako promenljivo i besmisleno, jer se ne događa po njinoj volji i njinim nadama. Da se negde izmire on i brat, to je sve više želeo, i da oboje potrče u ovu novu zemlju, barovitu, i ravnu, ali mirisnu i nebesnu, u kojoj su počeli da se smiruju, posle onolikog tumananja (53).

Everything which had come come so unexpectedly confused and choked him. In a different way and more sharply than his brother, Arandel Isaković felt a horror, the terrifying horror that everything around them is so transient and pointless, for it does not happen according to their will and their hopes. That he and his brother could be reconciled somewhere, that was what he wanted more and more, and both of them to run into this new land, marshy, and flat, but fragrant and celestial, in which they began to settle, after so much wandering.

Arandel wants reconciliation with his brother, and a return to the family which he scorned before. His motives are to be suspected, but like Vuk his sense of

self in time and history has been questioned. However, unlike Vuk his vision of a new land and the stars is associated with Dafina.

It is only in these passages describing Arandel's state of mind on his return home from his unsuccessful attempt to secure a divorce for Dafina that his moods and emotions are reflected in nature. In the end nature is also a reflection of the end of his hopes for a new life. Dafina dies as he arrives home towards morning, and as for Arandel "zvezde koje su gasnule, nije više gledao, kao ni svetlost, što je u visinama treptala" ("he no longer looked at the <sup>dimming</sup> stars,

nor the light which quivered in the heavens" 54). The stars which promised a new life for him exist only with and in Dafina, and as he holds her in his arms he sees the star for the last time:

Stade tek onda kad dublje zagleda u oči gospože Dafine koja izdahnu, u dva nepomična, modra kruga, boje zimskog neba, hladnog i čistog, koji izdaleka behu mali, ali koji su izbliza rasli i obuhvatili ga celog.

U izdisanju njegove snahe, koja više nije mogla da govori, njemu se učini kao da se pojavljuje visoko nebo. Kao i njegov brat, u snu, i on je nad njom video, van sebe od straha i žalosti, plave krugove i u njima zvezdu (55).

He stopped only when he looked deeper into the eyes of the Lady Dafina who had died, into the two motionless blue circles, the colour of a winter's sky, cold and pure, which from a distance were small, but which grew when near and swallowed him whole.

His sister-in-law could no longer speak, and in her last breath it

seemed to him as if heaven above appeared. Like his brother, in his sleep, he too saw above her, beside himself with fear and sorrow, circles of blue and in them a star.

As she dies the colour of the sky drains from her eyes, and Arandel "je nad njenim mrtvim telom gubio svest" ("lost consciousness over her dead body" 56). The cosmic vision of integral unity for Arandel dies with Dafina.

Both brothers are able to exert their will to a certain degree on the social world. In doing so, they have a space to act which is denied to Dafina. The functions which the brothers have in history are limited. Vuk is a soldier, and at the end of the novel resolves to devote his life to improving the lot of his countrymen living on his estate. Arandel is a merchant and has power in the commercial world. They give shape to their senses of past, present, and future in the symbols of power which they appropriate in symbolic language. Vuk lives according to the promise of his father, and Arandel imagines his wealth giving him power over the natural world. When their worlds are disrupted by other events and people they are able to re-assess their desires and present them in new forms, in the symbols of the star and a promised land. These symbols of re-birth and new beginnings give shape to time, and give them a purpose. They represent ways of conceiving of time and the self in history. However, Dafina does

not consider her fate in symbolic language. The meanings of the symbols appropriated by the brothers are rooted in a social and historical world in which she has no role. Dafina's alienation from the cultural world of the brothers is particularly evident in the masculine emphasis on the father figure in the symbolic language of the novel.

In her brother-in-law's house Dafina's time is not her own, the day being allotted to the company of the women of Zemun, and the evening to Arandel as is stated, "Dan je bio za njih, a veče je bilo za njega ("The day was for them, and the evening for him" 57). She feels envious of the two men "koje je volela i mrzela" ("whom she loved and hated" 58), but to whom she is tied. Her only sense of self is derived from her relationship to the two brothers. She is wife to Vuk and mother to his children, she is a desired object and then potential wife for Arandel. In front of Vuk she takes the children on her knee and plays the role he wants: "Decu je bila dala sluškinjama; samo pred mužem držala ih je na krilu" ("She had given the children to her maids; she only held them on her lap in front of her husband" 59). Arandel has seen another side when she puts the children in one wing of his house, and lives in another. She does not want children. But, she has no choices in life, and has lived her whole life according to the will of others:

Nemaština, samoća, boleština, sve joj se to učini ženska sudbina, kao i to bedno ostajanje i čekanje sad na jednog, sad na drugog. Seti se, odjednom, kuće svojih u Trstu, gde je bila ili lutka odevena šareno, ili sluškinja koja je uveče i ujutru svlačila, i oblačila, braću i matorog očuha, ribajući svake subote kantare i kamene klupe oko tezge. Seti se i braka u kome je bila tako sretna.

Rađala je decu, seljakala se, ali ne znajući nikad ni kuda će, ni zašto. Radosti njene i žalosti dolazile su potpuno slučajno, a najmanje po volji njenoj. I ova preljuba, i ovo uživanje sa jednim novim i drukčijim muškarcem, krišom, došlo je bez njene volje, po njinoj volji, neumitno. Stvar, stvar je bila, kao što će to i njene kćeri biti, uzimane i ostavljane, iscmakane i odbačene, lizane i udarene, bez reda, bez smisla. Sva ta ljubav prema njoj, zar nije bila neka razonada te dvojice (60).

Poverty, loneliness, illness, that all seemed to her women's fate, like the wretched leaving behind and waiting now for one, now for another. She remembered, suddenly, the house of her family in Trieste, where she was either a doll dressed gaily, or a servant who in the evening and in the morning would undress and dress her brothers and her old stepfather, scrubbing the scales and the stone benches around the counter every Saturday. She remembered her marriage in which she had been so happy.

She had children, moved, but never knowing neither where nor why. Her joys and her sorrows came completely by chance, and least of all by her will. And this adultery, and this pleasure with a new different man, secretly, came without her will, by their will.

*Inexorably*. A thing, she has been a thing, as her daughters will be too, taken and abandoned, kissed and rejected, fondled and beaten, without sense, pointlessly. All this love for her, was it not just like some diversion for the two men.

The issue for Dafina is not personal, but a matter which

concerns all women in her society. The future for women is only ever suffering, and "beše joj žao samo da su obe devojčice i da će i one, kad budu kao i ona, žene, toliko patiti" ("she was sorry only for both her little girls, that they too, when they are like her, women, will suffer so much" 61).

Her life with Vuk, accompanying him from garrison to garrison, his long absences, living in provincial towns, left her feeling dissatisfied. She begins to think of what the future might be like with Arandel "i da se teši bogatstvom u kome će od sada živeti, ako se preuda za devera" ("and to console herself with the wealth in which she would live from now, if she married her brother-in-law" 62). Any attempt to create a sense of her own history, possibilities for the future, her present, are always in relation to the two brothers. By contrast they are able, when the present appears out of their control, to give new shape to the times in which they live.

Dafina is characterised by silence. In the structure of the novel, alternating between different character points of view, information about her past is first made known through Arandel's memory of her when he was looking for a wife for his wayward brother. Further information is made known about her past from the point of view of Zemun society, before her past is considered from her own point of view:

Zatim je Zemun doznao još i to da je ona bila siročće, kad su je udali za Vuka Isakovića, i da je mislila da će joj on godinu dana biti kao otac, dok se ne rodi prvo dete, pa će joj tek onda postato muž (63).

Then Zemun heard more that she was an orphan when they married her to Vuk Isaković, and that for a year she thought he would be like a father to her until she had their first child.

The image of the father figure and the authority which it carries has pervaded all aspects of Dafina's life.

Dafina is excluded from the social organisations on which the brothers base their authority. Furthermore, she appears not to even possess the language which the brothers use to symbolise time. The image of stars associated with her eyes is what is seen by Arandel when "ona ga gledaše svojim lepim, modrim očima boje čistog, zimskog, večernjeg neba, mirno, kao da su se nad njima sjale zvezde" ("she looked at him with her beautiful, blue eyes the colour of a pure, winter's, evening sky, calmly, as stars shone above them" 64). He is first attracted to her "jer beše mlada, visoka, zdrava i jer je uporno ćutala, svojim velikim, modrim očima" ("because she was young, tall, healthy and because she maintained a stubborn silence, with her big, blue eyes" 65). The "stubborn silence" reveals a degree of resistance in Dafina, but which remains passive. She maintains her silence when in his house, and "pred njim, pre svega, ćutala je, isplakana, sa jednim tajanstvenim osmehom" ("in front of him, most of all, she was silent,

her tears now cried away, with a mysterious smile" 66). And on her deathbed, in Arandel's arms, she is described as the one "koja više nije mogla da govori" ("who could no longer speak" 67).

Dafina's silence symbolises her exclusion from the world of action, and from the world of culture. The symbols of time used by the two brothers are fundamentally associated with the authority which they derive from the social world. The power to initiate a new origin within the framework of the genealogical imperative is a masculine order. Dafina is alienated from the discourse of time itself. She reflects on the wretchedness of her past and her life with Vuk which seemed to her like "jedna duboka nesreća, u kojoj se ona uzalud trudila da nekud ode" ("a deep unhappiness, in which she had tried in vain to go away somewhere" 68). Her escape from the present in a journey is not associated with the cosmic imagery out of which the brothers construct an image of a whole new future.

Her happiest memories of her marriage to Vuk are their earliest days together when they would ride together in the countryside, and "ne znajući prvih meseci sa ženom ni da govori, jer ona nije znala nemački, a on ni grčki ni mletački, ispomagao se pesmom, igrankom, pogledima i poljupcima" ("not able even to speak with his wife, for she did not know German, and he neither Greek nor Italian, he communicated with song,



dance, glances and kisses" 69). At this point they are united in a fundamental equality which is reflected in the natural elements:

Sa mekošću vlažne zemlje i trave, sa šipragom koji je u aprilu počeo da pupi i miriše, sa zelenim padinama brda i svetlih, proletnih nebesa, udisala je tada mlada žena, prvi put, svog muža, kao otrovana (70).

With the softness of the damp earth and the grass, with the undergrowth which in April began to bud and give off its fragrance, with the green slopes of the hills and of the bright, spring skies, the young wife, then, for the first time, as if poisoned, inhaled her husband.

Without language the two of them are united in a natural world. In that world, Dafina shows her awareness of what is to come in her life with Vuk, but cannot change the course of time. She is destined to remain in the world of nature, rather than participate in the social world of culture.

In Arandel's house Dafina thinks back to the other houses she has known. There is a sense in which she has been imprisoned by the walls, and the masculine order of the culture which they represent. Arandel's house is the most intolerable:

Očeva kuća, naslage duvana, čohi i druge robe, tetkina soba, puna ikona i kandila, u kojoj se isprosila, pa sve ostale kuće i odaje, u kojima je živila sa mužem, prodoše joj kroz sećanje, tužne i prazne, bez ikakvog smisla. Ipak su one bile prijatne donekle, ali ova četiri žuta zida, šum reke, senka postelje i peći, bili su užasni u svojoj neprekidnosti, nepomičnosti, skamenjenosti (71).

Her father's house, the sheets of tobacco, the cloth and other merchandise, her aunt's room, full of icons and oil lamps, in which she was given in marriage, and all the other houses and rooms in which she had lived with her husband, passed through her memory sad and empty, with no point. Nevertheless they were pleasant to an extent, but these four yellow walls, the sound of the river, the shadow of the bed and the stove, were terrible in their constancy, stillness and ossification.

Arandel is pleased to take her "zatvoren u četiri žuta zida" ("closed in the four yellow walls" 72) for the secrecy which they afford. For Dafina they represent a prison, and from the beginning she sat by the window of her room, looking at the river below, the symbol of time associated with her:

Dugo se zadržao kod velikog prozora sa rešetkom, koji je gledao na reku. To mesto odabra prvih dana da se isplače. Dan i noć proticala je tu široka, ustajala reka. I, u njoj, njena sen (73).

She lingered for a long time by the large, latticed window, which looked out onto the river. She chose this place during her first days for her tears. Day and night the broad, sluggish river flowed by here. And, in it, her shadow.

Dafina chooses for herself and her sorrow a place by the window, the exit from the four walls of her room. The final sentences of the above quotation occur as the heading for Chapter Three of the novel (74). She is often described by the window, and her shadow in the river: "Tako je i svoju senku, kod prozora, gledala, u mulju, koji je dan i noć proticao" ("So she would watch

her shadow in the mire, which flowed by day and night" 75); and after her fall "čutala je uporno, provodeći dan za danom kod prozora, nad vodom" ("she maintained her stubborn silence, spending day after day by the window, above the water" 76).

The sentence which forms the heading for Chapter Three mirrors the refrain which is associated with Vuk's vision of the stars, "Beskrajni, plavi krug. U njemu, zvezda". However, there is an important difference. The centre of Vuk's symbolic representation of the future has a star at its centre. Whereas, Dafina is more closely linked with the symbol of the river, casting her shadow into it. She combines an image of time with the duality of self. The river comes to occupy an important position in her life in Arandel's house. After spending the night with Arandel, she dreams that Vuk comes down the river threatening her:

Iznemogloj od bdenja, umornoj i bednoj,  
uplašenoj i zamišljenoj, učinilo joj se  
da zaspala, baš kada ugleda, pod prozorom  
kako joj ide po vodi muž, sav obliven  
krvlju i moka; neobučeni i neočešljani  
Vuk Isaković, sa ogromnom batinom u ruci,  
koja je dopirala do tavanice (77).

Exhausted from her vigil, tired and  
wretched, frightened and absorbed in  
thought, she seemed to fall asleep just  
when she spied her husband under the  
window coming along the water, covered in  
blood and wet; undressed and tousled Vuk  
Isaković, with a huge rod in his hand  
which reached to the roof.

The obvious phallic threat is Dafina's punishment for transgressing the promise she made to Vuk when she

married him, when he seemed to her like a father.

Arandel finds his way to her bed following an episode in which he almost drowns in the river. Her fate is bound to the river, such that "her very knowledge of time comes to depend on the river" (78):

Tako se naviknu da primeti sitne promene u svemu tome vidljivom, pa i nevidljivom. Kroz nekoliko dana već, ona je znala, po boji vode i vrbaka, koji je čas dana. Uveče, znala je po boji neba i obliku oblaka da tačno nasluti vreme za sutrašnji dan (79).

So she became accustomed to notice the slight changes in everything visible, and even invisible. In a few days she knew by the colour of the water and the willows what time of day it was. In the evening, she knew by the colour of the sky and the <sup>shape of</sup> ~~weather~~ of the clouds to tell precisely the ~~weather~~ for dawn the following day.

The different relationships with nature which the three characters of Seobe expose have far-reaching consequences for Dafina. It is not nature as such, but its interaction with the world of culture, tradition, and history, which proves threatening to Dafina. On a symbolic plane, both Arandel and Vuk create history, impose order on their social lives, and their private hopes and fears. The moment before Dafina falls she imagines herself under water looking at the sky above. Her usual passive view of nature changes into one where it bears down on her. She is overcome with her own symbol of time, the river which cannot change its course:

Kad se zaljulja zid, iza tog priviđenja,

ona još vide neko zlatno klasje i brda  
 što se prosuše kroz zid, zajedno sa  
 talasima žita, raži i zobu, sa tavanice.  
 Zatim sinuše pred očima njenim čitavi  
 kolutovi zvezda, plavih, ljubičastih i  
 žutih, i preliše je vanredne mlake vode,  
 nad kojima su tekla i nebesa. Ciknuvši  
 grozno i skočivši uvis, ona se nađe, lice  
 u lice, s mužem, krvavim i užasnim i  
 ugleda pred sobom Vuka Isakovića, koji se  
 raspadao. Tako se ugleda, u snu, strašni  
 neki medved, kad se bežeći iz šume, od  
 vukova, iznenada, istrči pred neku stenu  
 (80).

When the wall behind the apparition began  
 to sway, she could still see some golden  
 grain and the hills which poured through  
 the wall, together with waves of wheat,  
 rye and oats from the ceiling. Then,  
 whole circles of blue, violet and yellow  
 stars flashed before her eyes, and  
 wonderful warm waters washed over her,  
 above which the skies floated. With a  
 terrible shriek she jumped into the air  
 and found herself face to face with her  
 bloody and horrible husband, she caught  
 sight of Vuk Isaković before her, who was  
 disintegrating. So one sees in a dream,  
 some terrible bear, when fleeing from the  
 forest, away from wolves, suddenly, run  
 before a cliff.

Dafina then falls as a result of which she dies, and the  
 child which she is carrying dies with her. Ironically,  
 the genealogical imperative to become the father which  
 has driven Vuk on is denied him by Dafina.

By being subject to the world of history and  
 culture which inscribes the values of male tradition  
 into time, Dafina lives outside the time of Arandel and  
 Vuk. She cannot bring an order to bear on time which is  
 ultimately for her a continual process of degeneration  
 towards death. As she approaches death the time is  
 specified as a chart of her progress in her final hours:

"pred večer" ("towards evening"); "oko pet sati" ("about five o' clock"); "oko sedam sati" ("about seven o' clock" 81). However, Vuk and Arandel do not live in a time dominated by biological decay. They live in a time which mirrors the continual regeneration of nature. The whole novel is composed around Vuk's departure for war, and return one year later in spring. Spring is the time of natural renewal. Vuk returns to a role in the community and nation. His return is not to the same geographic or temporal point, but a return to the values which the two brothers have inherited and which they can symbolically inscribe into time and history. They return to the traditions from which they derive power and authority in their different ways in the community. Vuk's return is a regenerative cycle. In Seobe the characters link time, as the process by which the consciousness becomes aware of self, to the self in relation to history and nature. In relation to history and society, Crnjanski projects time as a cultural order. The male characters are able to utilise the opportunities of the cultural order as reflections of their desire for a sense of self, and for permanence and stability in a world which demands change.

#### Druga knjiga seoba

The clash between nature and culture in Seobe is less prominent in Druga knjiga seoba, although the

symbols of the star and of Russia as a promised land do figure. The tensions which evolve between the different voices is of greater significance in structuring time in this second novel. The chronicle, authorial, historical, and epic voices as discussed in Chapter Four of this study each link Pavle's sense of self to the wider flow of social time and history in different ways. They contribute variously to Pavle's sense of identity and purpose. In this section of the thesis the epic voice is developed for its expression of a mythic consciousness of time, which stands in contrast to the psychological time expressed by the authorial voice through character point of view. Both these levels contrast with the temporal order inherent in the historical voice.

Pavle Isaković is facing a new historical epoch. The regiment in which he serves was created by the Austrians using Serbs who had fled their native land to the south to escape Ottoman domination. The regiment defended the frontier and fought the Turks, but times have changed: "Vreme ratovima je prošlo. Drukčiji ljudi trebaju austrijskom carstvu." ("The time of the wars has passed. Different men are needed by the Austrian Empire" 82); "Vremena ratova <sup>had</sup> ~~have~~ bila su zauvek prošla" ("The times of the wars <sup>had</sup> ~~have~~ passed forever" 83). The wars are specifically those against the Turks:

U to vreme, sredinom XVIII veka, kad su turski ratovi nedavno bili završeni,

Istok je bio odgurnut, daleko, od Beča. Turska je, u austrijske zemlje - i u Evropu - gledala još samo sa jednog prozora, otkuda se u daljini vidi, sa tvrđave beogradskog grada, Kalemegdana (84).

At that time, in the middle of the eighteenth century, when the Turkish wars were not long over, the East was pushed a long way away from Vienna. Turkey looked at the Austrian lands, and at Europe, from just one window, <sup>which could be seen</sup> in the distance, from the fortress of Belgrade, Kalemegdan.

The narrator describes the new historical epoch facing the Serbs as part of a game played by the Russian and Austrian empresses and the the English and French kings. "U toj igri su se dobijale zemlje, a gubilo stotine hiljada krvavih vojnika, pretvorenih u lešine, na poljima zavejanim snegom" ("In the game lands were gained, and hundreds of thousands of bloody soldiers lost, turned into corpses on snow-covered fields" 85). The political intrigues and military contests between the European Powers determine the fate of the Serbs with no regard for the desires of the Serbs themselves.

In Vienna, waiting for permission from the Russian embassy to leave for Kiev, Pavle talks with his former commander Engelshofen, an Austrian commander who has great respect for the Serbs. In this conversation Pavle reveals many of the reasons for wishing to leave for Russia:

A on mu je pričao da je rođen godine 1715, i da je svet, i ratove počeo da gleda, svojim očima, od godine 1735, kada su primljeni u austrijsku vojsku, iz koje



sad odlaze. Prva velika prevara, koju su doživeli, u njoj, bila je što su ih, stalno, varali obećanjima, da će se u Serviju vratiti. Zatim su videli da su samo ajlugdžije u toj vojsci (86).

And he told him that he was born in 1715, and that he began to see the world and the wars with his own eyes, from the year 1735, when they were admitted into the Austrian army, which they are now leaving. The first major deception which they experienced in the army was that they were constantly deceived by promises that they would return to Serbia. Then they saw that they were only mercenaries in that army.

Pavle continues to outline that when they crossed the frontier into Austria with numerous others, the Isaković family were amongst the leaders in the emigration.

Everyone they brought with them came "da živi na oružju" ("to live by their weapons" 87). Pavle is less

concerned with the new historical positions of the European Powers than with the military traditions which are part of the Serbian heritage. He believes that they will continue that tradition in Russia, "Tamo će biti, svi, vojnici. Isakovići žele da umru kao vojnici, u bici. A ne u postelji, kao sindikusi, trgovci, pisari, gaziblate" ("There they will all be soldiers. The Isakovičs want to die like soldiers in battle. And not in bed, like bureaucrats, merchants, clerks,

*peasants,* " 88).

Pavle sees the honour and the existence of the nation at stake. What faces them in Austria is worse than they faced in Serbia under the Turks. They face a

future in which they will be "tuđi paori, na tuđoj zemlji" ("alien serfs on alien land" 89). The issue confronts the whole nation:

Njih su austrijski đenerali zvali, da pređu na hrišćansku stranu, da žive u hrišćanstvu - a gde je to hrišćanstvo? Nisu izigrani samo Isakovići, svi su oni prešli na nesreću. Velika je to prevara (90).

The Austrian generals invited them to cross over to the Christian side, to live in Christianity - and where is that Christianity. Not only the Isakovičs were tricked, they all crossed over into unhappiness. It is a great deception.

Pavle is struggling against a new historical epoch from which he feels alienated. His views of honour, and the military tradition of the Serbs belong to a culture which is at odds with the politics of his day.

Engelshofen, to a certain degree, recognises this view in his remark on the significance of the Battle of Kosovo. He reflects on the Serbian national memory:

Međutim, ako primete da ih lažu i varaju, da im data reč nije održana, to pamte. U stoleća!

Sa Turcima se - tvrdio je Engelshofena - nose oko nekog Kosova (Engelshofen je pisao: Cassova) već nekih trista šeset godina. Serbi ne zaboravljaju! (91).

However, if they notice that they are being lied to and deceived, that a promise is not kept, they remember it. For centuries!

With the Turks - Engelshofen confirmed - they have been *bothered* about some Kosovo (Engelshofen wrote: Cassova) for some three hundred and sixty years. The Serbs do not forget!

Pavle's hopes for going to Russia derive from the defeat

of the nation at Kosovo, and the subsequent fate of his nation. Pavle described the three hundred and sixty years specified by Engelshofen to the secretary of the Russian embassy in Vienna, Volkov, as if a single moment taken from history:

Isaković se onda trže i progovor., pa poče da priča, kako su Serbi, na Kosovu, carstvo izgubili, kako je car Lazar poginuo, ali Miloš rasporio Murata i kako su oni, Isakovići, u Austriju prešli, i kako žive sad u Sremu i temišvarskoj Generalkomandi, u Banatu, koji su Novom Servijom nazvali (92).

Isaković then started and began to speak, and he began to tell how the Serbs lost an empire at Kosovo, how the emperor Lazar fell, but Miloš *disembowelled* Murat and how they, the Isaković family, crossed into Austria, and how they live now in Srem at the Temišvar military post, in the Banat, which they called New Serbia.

Volkov dismisses Pavle's observations on his reasons for wishing to emigrate to Russia, saying that Pavle "počeo je da sanja Murata i cara Lazara, na Kosovu" ("has begun to dream about Murat and the Emperor Lazar, at Kosovo" 93).

Pavle's sense of the past, of his nation, of the family are all part of the Kosovo myth which he carries with him. The myth is a vital element in his own sense of identity, and in his belief that Russia represents their salvation, since "ta selidba u Rosiju nisu oficirska posla, nego spas za sve njih, iz bede, iz jada, iz nasilja, iz poniženja i muka". ("the emigration to Russia is not the affair of officers, but salvation

for all of them from poverty, from wretchedness, from tyranny, from humiliation and pain" 94). His vision of Russia is a salvation. However, although he appears to be continuing Vuk Isaković's dream in Seobe, there is a difference between their views of what Russia offers to the Serbs. Pavle hopes to continue as before. He explains this to one of the officials he meets on his way, Višnjevski:

Posle svega što su on, i njegovi bratenci, videli, otkad su izišli iz svoje Servije, oni imaju još samo jednu želju. Da se pojave imenom svojim i sabljom svojom, u rosijskoj armiji, kad rosijske armije u rat krenu. Žele da život završe, a ne žele da ga ponova otpočinju. To svojoj deci i svom nacionu ostavljaju. Za njih je dockan da opet počnu. Oni žele još samo da svoje familije nasele, tamo, gde se i drugi njihovi sunarodnici, u Rosiji, naseľavaju - u provinciji zovomaja Nova Servija (95).

After everything which he and his cousins have seen since they left their Serbia, they have just one wish. That they appear with their name and their sword in the Russian army, when the Russian armies go to war. They want to finish their lives, and they do not want to begin them again. They are leaving that to their children and people. It's too late for them to begin again. They want just to move their families, there, where their other fellow-countrymen are moving, in Russia - in the province called New Serbia.

Višnjevski is considered a "bivši Srbin" ("former Serb" 96) by Pavle. He has lost all contact with the nation and is dismissive of Pavle's view of the glorious days of the Serbian Empire "o kom niko nije čuo pre, i koje

možda samo oni znaju" ("about which no-one has heard before, and of which perhaps only they know" 97).

Vuk in Seobe and Rjepnin in Roman o Londonu are both concerned with a return to a sense of being which involves them in a regenerative cycle. However, Pavle's concern is not to begin again in any sense, but to seek a continuity of his epic consciousness of self in history. The absence of progressive time and change gives Pavle a sense of being. His sense of being is grounded in what Gunnell refers to as the "participative character of the mythic vision in which the individual, society, and nature are experienced as a compact and consubstantial unity" (98). Pavle only gains a sense of being by his surrender of individuality to the social order of the myth. On an individual level, Pavle is protected from the terror of a historical progression which is threatening the survival of the nation and the deep national aspect of his own being. In the book Cosmos and History, Mircea Eliade describes the mythic consciousness of time as "the myth of eternal repetition", which "has the meaning of a supreme attempt towards the 'staticization' of becoming, towards annulling the irreversibility of time" (99). Myth necessarily involves the denial of authentic being-in-time as becoming, and gives a static and fixed image of the self. In the light of these two comments on the status of mythic time, Pavle's concern is not to

project himself onto the historical stage, but to find a sense of self in which purpose, meaning and being are self-present. The "consubstantial unity" of the individual, nature, and society sought by Pavle is to be realised in a cycle of repetition.

The Kosovo myth represents a self-sufficient temporal system. The beginning of the myth is not part of a historical process, and as such it lies outside the changes which time brings. In its denial of change, the myth acknowledges no end. Biological time, decay, and death have no meaning when viewed against a temporal order which denies change. Time does not divide individuals from the meanings of past, present, and future in the mythic moment which spans the centuries. Pavle shows no concern at the prospect of death in battle, because it is a symbolic gesture based on the military tradition of the Serbs, and which reinforces the spirit of self-sacrifice central to the Kosovo ethic. He says to Volkov, "Oni idu u Rosiju, ne za činove, ne za porcione novce, nego zato da ratuju, na strani slavom uvenčanih rosijskih trupa" ("They are going to Russia, not for rank, not for money, but to wage war on the side of the Russian troops crowned with glory" 100). And later in the meeting he comments, "Oni žele da ostanu oficiri, da završe život u bitkama" ("They want to remain officers, to finish their lives in battles" 101). Pavle speaks to Volkov as if he is the

spokesperson for the whole Isaković family and the Serbian nation. Pavle's sense of being-in-time in the mythic time scale of Kosovo is a process of eternal repetition. The myth is without end in human terms, since it represents the national existence, and will continue after his death. Pavle's apparent willingness to die in battle represents the continuity of the myth.

This sense of self-presence and promise of meaning in life stands in contrast to Pavle's acknowledgement of change. The times of the Turkish wars are over, and he recognises that there may come changes in future generations. Pavle reflects these features of change and transience in time in his personal memories, in which meaning and purpose are not self-present. Close to the beginning of the novel he is imprisoned by Garsuli for his part in the disturbances amongst the Serbs. The comment is made that "u tom zatvoru, apšenič bi brzo naučio kako je u mrtvačkom sanduku, a izgubio bi i pojam o vremenu" ("in the prison, the detainee would quickly learn what it is like in a coffin, and he would even lose his sense of time" 102). However, Pavle does not lose his concept of time. In his consciousness he continues to record memories and sensations. He reflects on his meeting with Garsuli, about which "toliko je bio zadovoljan, onim što Garsuliju reče, da je malo falilo pa da, po svom običaju, pogladi svoje, svilene, plave, brke" ("he was so satisfied by what he

said to Garsuli that he *nearly smoothed* his silky, blonde moustache, as was his habit" 103). Pavle had not shown any dishonour or shame when arrested, and his character would not break under the strain of incarceration.

Pavle's sense of time passing continues and is measured purely by changes in consciousness:

Sve što je mogao da čuje, i vidi, bile su njegove misli, ali su one proletale brzo kao laste, a činile su se zelene, crvene, a prskale su kroz njegovu glavu, kao varnice. Sedeći u crvenim, utegnutim čakširima i beloј košulji, do pasa, drhtao je (104).

Everything which he could hear, and see, were his thoughts, but they flew quickly by like swallows, and appeared green, red, and flew through his head, like sparks. Sitting in his red, tight trousers and white shirt, open to the waist, he trembled.

He reflects on what is happening outside the prison, where spring is coming, in stark contrast to his surroundings in prison. He considers the Serbs' trek from Serbia into Austria, and their possible return or further emigration to Russia, he thinks about his cousins and his family, and he thinks of his wife who died the previous year giving birth prematurely:

Ona je bila mrtva već više od godinu dana, umrla na porođaju, kao i njeno dete, što je trebala, u sedmom mesecu, da rodi. Pavle o njoj nikad nije govorio i bila je iščezla iz njegovog sećanja, iz njegovih misli. On nije imao ništa protiv nje, ali taj brak nije bio iz ljubavi i ona mu se činila, kao doživljaj, beznačajna (105).



She was dead for more than a year, she died giving birth, like the child which she was to deliver in her seventh month. Pavle never spoke of her and had effaced her from his memory, from his thoughts. He did not have anything against her, but the marriage was not out of love and she appeared to him, as an experience, insignificant.

The memories which Pavle recalls here and later are not of the same order as the Kosovo myth. They are part of a past which is irrecoverable, a past which "bilo pa prošlo" ("was and has passed" 106). His memory of his wife becomes a recurring motif in the novel. His sense of guilt at not recognising his love for her at the time is transformed into an overpowering feeling. As he journeys to Russia the thought occurs to him that "na celom svetu, za njega, sreće je moglo biti samo u tom jednom jedinom ljudskom biću, u toj ženi koju je sahranio" ("in the whole world, for him, happiness may only be in that one human being, in the wife whom he buried" 107).

The happiness which had always eluded his family is lost in the past. Reflecting on his past, particularly on the family and Serbia he is brought to the conclusion:

Sve je to bila prošlost i sve je to bilo, zauvek, prošlo.

Ono, što bi ga porazilo, kad bi se toga setio, bila je promenljivost ljudske sreće, i u tom, prošlom, životu. Sreća je ljudska bila tako nestalna. Dovoljna je bila neka, iznenadna, selidba, neka bolest u kući, neka nesreća familijarna, nema svađa, neki dug dužniku, nestašica novca - da o nesretnim

ljubavima i ne govorimo - pa da sretan  
čovjek postane nesretan, kao da sretan  
nikad nije bio (108).

That was all in the past, it had passed  
forever.

That which ~~struck~~ him most,  
when he remembered it, was the  
transience of human happiness, even in  
that past life. Human happiness was so  
unstable. It was enough for some sudden  
migration, some illness in the house,  
some family accident, an unspoken  
quarrel, a debt to a debtor, a lack of  
money - and not to mention unhappy love -  
for a happy man to become unhappy, as if  
he had never been happy.

Pavle transfers his feelings of insecurity at the  
transience of life to the future, and even to the  
prospects that await him and his cousins in Russia. "Na  
tom putu Isakovič, prvi put, počeo da se pita, kud li  
sad, i on, i njegovi bratenci, idu?" ("On his journey,  
Isakovič, for the first time, began to ask himself where  
were he and his cousins now going?" 109). His  
questioning of what fate awaited him in Russia stands in  
stark contrast to the Russia which was part of his  
mythic consciousness: "Ono što mu se činilo neprolazno,  
bila je ta njegova želja da ode i da se pojavi u Rosiji,  
da se tamo odseli" ("That which appeared to him  
intransient was the desire of his to go away and to  
appear in Russia, to migrate there" 110).

Pavle lives with two senses of his being-in-time.  
One is a mythic consciousness that presents the world  
and his role in it as consubstantial, and in which he  
has a purpose. It is a picture of an immutable reality,

based on the values of the Kosovo myth. The second is his life in a reality which is constantly changing shape and "koja biva sasvim drukčija, nego što je naša volja želi da bude" ("which is completely different from the one that our will wants it to be" 111). This second picture of reality has no image of the present, but of dreams for the future and a past which is irrecoverable. As Pavle thinks of the voices which spur him into action he asks:

Da li sa zvezda?

Ili, iz našeg prošlog života i  
naših uspomena.

Ili su vesti iz budućnosti, koja  
nam se sprema, bez našeg znanja, protiv  
naše volje i sasvim drugačija, nego što  
se očekivala (112).

Are they from the stars?

Or, from our past life and our  
memories.

Or are they news from the future,  
which is being prepared for us, without  
our knowledge, against our will and  
completely different to what was  
expected.

In the second picture of reality, Pavle has no sense of being in the present, since as Christopher Norris comments "time is an endless deferring of presence" (113). As time is denied entry into the present, but remains in some realm of dream, past, or future, so there is no authentic self to be discovered in the present. Time divides self from a knowledge of the self. The present is "a moment compounded of manifold retentions and anticipations, never existing in the isolated instant of awareness" (114). Furthermore, if

presence and being are denied entry into the present, so truth and meaning can only exist in Pavle's mythic consciousness. Pavle's journey to Russia is an image both of the progression of his psychological life from the past into an unknown future, and of the repetition of the myth. Given that the myth denies history, and historical change denies the present any meaning, Pavle personifies the role of chance as the link between self and history in the remark that "slučaj je najveći komedijant u životu ljudi i naroda" ("chance is the greatest actor in the lives of people and nations" 115). A similar phrase is used by Crnjanski in his Itaka i komentari. "Slučaj je najveći komedijant u svetu" ("Chance is the greatest <sup>comedian</sup> in the world" 116).

Pavle's sense of being-in-time comes into conflict with the history of nations and of economies which have an interest in his nation. The interests of the Austrian and Russian empires are of no concern to Pavle. Similarly, the private desires and national identity of Pavle is of no concern to them. He and the Serbs were allowed to be soldiers and fight the Turks, for as long as it was in the Habsburg interest for them to do so. The Isaković family meet with a similar response in Russia. They are expected to fight against the same Prussian army that they had to face for the Austrians. The Russian general Kostjurin has been ordered "da priprema trupe, koje će ići u rat, na Prajsku. Ima

izgleda da se taj rat nastavi, uskoro" ("to prepare the troops, which will go to war, against Prussia. There is a possibility that the war will be continued, soon"

117). The Russian authorities are only interested in their ability to fight for Russia:

Kostjurin je, tog kasnog, zimskog, dana, godine 1753, u Kijevu, želeo samo da se uveri u mogućnost pretvaranje tih doseljenika, u ritama, u stajaću vojsku, koju je Rosija, tih godina, stvarala, i za rat pripremala (118).

Kostjurin, on that late winter's day in 1753, in Kiev, wanted only to make sure of the possible conversion of these newcomers, dressed in rags, into a standing army which Russia was building up in those years, and preparing for war.

Pavle sees a vision of Russia in which "ovo nije bila Rosija kojoj se nadao, to je bio neki ogromni Garsuli, koji je imao lice, sad Ševičevo, sad Kostjurinovo, sad Trifunovo" ("this was not the Russia for which he hoped, it was a huge Garsuli, who had a face, now like Šević, now Kostjurin, now Trifun" 119). Russia is no longer a vision of his hopes or mythic consciousness, but is associated with the Austrian and Russian officials, and with the Serb who encouraged them to come to Russia.

The fate of Pavle and his cousins is being regulated by a continental consciousness then beginning to emerge amongst the courts of Europe. The Austrians no longer fight the Turks, and "sad se radilo o granicama carstva, o im. peratrici lično, o Beču, o Austriji, o Evropi" ("now the matter concerned the

frontiers of the empire, the empress herself, Vienna, Austria, Europe" 120). Russia after their arrival was beginning to adopt outward signs of the spread of European culture. The spread of European culture had begun before the arrival of the Isakovičes in Kiev, which they did not even realise was a city built by Russian engineers "prema planu grofa Rastrelli, Italijana, koji je bio došao u Rosiju, a želeo da ostvari neku Italiju, u snegu" ("according to the plan of Count Rastrelli, an Italian, who had come to Russia, and wanted to create an Italy, in the snow" 121). The members of the Isakovič family will go their separate ways, their different hopes, backgrounds, temperaments, ages, dictate "da njihova budućnost bude različita" ("that their futures be varied" 122). As such, the sense of mythic consciousness which bound Pavle to the family and to the nation is also beginning to break up, under the pressure of their personal desires and the opportunities offered to them in Russia. The Serbian nation which emigrated to Russia also disappears in time.

The details which are recorded by the historical voice regarding the source and preservation of information are presented as self-evident facts. The information via the written word is not disputed, it has been written and preserved by individuals who are the makers of the history of which we are the inheritors

today. The details which establish the activities of Pavle and the source of information are common in Druga knjiga seoba:

Prema jednom pismu bolešljivog rođaka Pavlovog, lajtnanta Isaka Isakovića, u Novom Sadu, izgleda da je Pavle bio u Temišvaru, do poslednjih dana avgusta, godine 1752 (123).

According to a letter of Pavle's sickly relative, lieutenant Isak Isaković in Novi Sad, it appears that Pavle was in Temišvar until the last days of August, 1752.

Prema jednom raportu sindika, policmajstora u Gracu, koji se zvao Franc Šram, a koji je to javljao Generalkomandi, neki rusijski, kapetan, Isakov, stigao je, iz Oseka, u Grac, desetoga septembra 1752, na pošti, iz varoši Marburg (124).

According to a local official's report, the police chief in Graz, who was called Franz Schram, and who communicated it to the General Command, a Russian captain, Isakov, arrived from Osek in Graz, on tenth September 1752, on the postchaise from the town of Marburg.

The second example quoted continues to cite from the report what Pavle was doing during his stay in Graz. What the police did not realise was that Pavle was working for the Russian embassy and collecting information on military dispositions in the Habsburg Empire. However, the accuracy of the information can be gauged with the benefit of hindsight, and the collection of other sources of information, such that even though they did not realise Pavle's true identity or purpose "mi danas znamo da su navodi, u tom izveštaju, uglavnom,

tačni" ("we know today that the statements, in that communication, are largely correct" 125). The inclusion of Pavle in the records of the historical epoch effaces the end of biological life, even beyond his own knowledge or will. The members of the Isaković family "ne znaju da žive u sadašnjosti, u našem vremenu" ("do not know that they live in the present, in our time" 126).

The necessity for written verification of what happened in history means that individuals, once their existence is no longer recorded, are lost to history:

O životu Isakovića, posle godine 1754, znamo samo toliko, da se morao nastaviti. Čak i da je Isaković umro, teško da bi mi to, lako, danas, znali (127).

Of Isaković's life after 1754 we only know that it must have continued. Even the fact of his death would be difficult for us to know today.

However, it is assumed that the characters did live on:

Istorija je zabeležila, da se, posle sedamnaest godina, od njihovih naselenija, pojavila u Rosiji čudna fatamorgana na nebu. Koje sa zove Aura Borealis. Ali istorija ne beleži šta su oni mislili, dok su gledali, tu fantastičnu, nebesnu pojavu. Kakvog je smisla imalo u njihovom životu? (128).

History has recorded that seventeen years after their emigration a wonderful phantasmagoria appeared in the sky, which is called the Aura Borealis. But history does not note what they thought while they were watching the fantastic heavenly sight. What sort of sense did it make in their lives?

The two quotations above are taken from the final



chapter of the novel, which has the heading "Seobe se nastavljau večno" ("Migrations continue eternally" 129). The progression of history cannot trace the Isakovičs any further. The measurement of social time in history covers a greater time scale than the personal measurement of psychological time, although in psychological time the characters are able to speculate on a future which history cannot since it only recognises by hindsight.

Pavle's mythic consciousness of self in time is stable for as long as the national consciousness continues to recognise it. His sense of time as a function of his consciousness is ever-changing. History, as the recording of events organised according to the social time of the calendar is also transient. Mythic, psychological, and historical time are all fragile. As the Isakovič family face a new historical epoch, so that epoch will end and another begin. The lives of the Isakovič family may or may not be preserved in a future epoch which will order events in time according to its own necessity, and make a new history. Cultures, traditions, and societies change over the epochs. They leave behind traces of a former existence, which will be forgotten. In the final pages of the novel, details from population censuses trace the gradual erosion of the numbers who categorised themselves as Serbian, until "kad je taj popis

stanovništva vršen, godine 1900, nije nađen, serbski, NIKO!" ("when the population census was taken in 1900, there was NO-ONE to be found, who was Serbian" 130).

The Isaković family and the other Serbs who emigrated to Russia exist only on the periphery of the historical epoch which the historical voice recognises as leading to today. The closing paragraphs of the novel suggest an end to the order of time in the eventual disappearance of the past, the instability of the present, the uncertainty of the future, and the eternity that is just this:

Na reci Ingul, naći će: Pančevo!

Naći će i jednu Suboticu! I jedan Nadlak!

Godine i sad prolaze, leto prođe i lišće žuto opada, a zatim sve zaveje sneg. Ali će, na proleće, Dnjepar opet krenuti, i valjati se, veselo, kroz tu zemlju mrtvih, prema moru, uz pesmu i igru živih.

Godine će prolaziti. Ko bi mogao nabrojati tice, koje se sele, ili sunčane zrake, koje Sunce seli, sa Istoka na Zapad i sa Severa na Jug? Ko bi mogao da predskaze, kakvi će se narodi seliti i kuda, kroz stotinu godina, kao što se taj nacion selio? Ko bi mogao nabrojati zrna, koja će idućeg proleća, nicali na svetlu, u Evropi, Aziji, Americi, Africi?

Neshvatljivo je to ljudskom umu.

Tamo, kud su Isakovići i taj Soldatenvolk otišli, kao i toliki njihovi sunarodnici, koji su na svojim leđima, kao puž, svoju kuću nosili, nema više traga, svemu tome, sem ta dva-tri imena.

Bilo je seoba i biće ih večno, kao i porođaja, koji će se nastaviti.

Ima seoba.

Smrti nema! (131).

On the river Ingul, there is a Pančevo!

There is a Subotica! And a Nadlak too!

The years are passing even now, summer passes and the yellow leaves fall, and then the snow covers everything. But, in spring, the Dnieper will again move and roll merrily, across the land of the dead, towards the sea, to the song and dance of the living.

The years will pass. Who will be able to count the birds which migrate, or the rays which the Sun casts from East to West and from North to South? Who will be able to tell which peoples will migrate where a hundred years from now, as that nation migrated. Who will be able to count the seeds which will sprout in the world next spring, in Europe, Asia, America, Africa?

It is incomprehensible to the human mind.

There is no longer any trace, there, where the Isakovičes and their soldiers went, like so many of their fellow-countrymen, who carried their houses on their backs like snails, except for those two or three names.

There have been migrations, and there will be forever, like the births which will continue.

There is migration.

There is no death!

As time passes individuals and nations disappear.

Milošević has pointed to the pessimistic tone of this final passage of the novel:

Viziju sveopšteg proticanja i nestajanja dopunjava i motiv seobe sunčevih zrakova, pa tako sudbina Pavla Isakoviča postaje deo jedne tako reći kosmičke sudbine (132).

The motif of the movement of the sun's rays expands the vision of universal flow and disappearance, such that the fate of Pavel Isakovič becomes a part of, so to say, a cosmic fate.

In the novels Seobe and Druga knjiga seoba both Vuk and Pavle Isakovič contemplate death as a symbol of continuity. For Vuk, death is a part of the

regenerative cycle, and for Pavle it is absorbed into the eternal repetition of epic consciousness. Death rebirth, eternal repetition, regenerative cycles are categories of temporal order which humanise time and the broad sweep of historical epochs. Vuk and Pavle Isaković impose order, and make sense of time scales larger than the personal by absorbing them into the culture, traditions, and historical processes with which they identify. In this way the self, confronted by new challenges in the inherently open vastness of history, resists the continual degeneration which is described in the final chapter of Druga knjiga seoba. Individuals such as Pavle and his family, whole communities, and nations disappear, to be supplanted by others in a continuing saga. Each stage of the saga establishes its own origin, and reaches its own end in a duration which has no meaning of and to itself. Time is a structure of continuity, change, renewal, and disappearance. It is structured by human beings and human societies, but everything will ultimately reach oblivion in an eternal duration not of human making, in which there is no death, only continual movement.

## CHAPTER SIX

### Notes

1. III, p143.
2. III, p143.
3. III, pp143-144.
4. III, p142.
5. II, p26.
6. II, pp54-55.
7. II, p43.
8. II, p63.
9. IX, p56.
10. VIII, p67.
11. IV, p20.
12. V, p471.
13. Mikhail Bakhtin, "Epic and Novel", The Dialogical Imagination, edited by Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press, 1983, p13.
14. I, p118.
15. III, p15.
16. Frederick Nietzsche, "The use and Abuse of History", The Complete Works, edited by Oscar Levy, vol 5, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1927, p17.
17. III, p140.
18. III, p89.
19. Patricia Drechsel Tobin, Time and the Novel: The Genealogical Imperative, Princeton University Press, 1978, p5.
20. III, p89.
21. III, p191.
22. III, p16, p223.

## CHAPTER SIX

23. III. p98.
24. III. pp144-145.
25. Nikola Milošević, Roman Miloša Crnjanskog: Problem univerzalnog iskaza, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1970, p127.
26. III. p83.
27. III. p83.
28. III. p83.
29. III. p83.
30. Radovan Vučković, "Osnovne crte simbolike i strukture romana Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Književne analize, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Sarajevo, 1972, p111.
31. III. p88.
32. III. p142.
33. III. p92.
34. III. p147.
35. III. pp145-146.
36. Nikola Milošević, p126.
37. III. p5 and p209.
38. III. p6.
39. III. p40.
40. III. p40.
41. III. p40.
42. III. p134, p146.
43. III. p148.
44. III. pp227-228.
45. Nikola Milošević, p142.
46. Novica Petković, Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 1985, p16.

## CHAPTER SIX

47. III. p79.
48. III. pp78-79.
49. III. p79.
50. III. p79.
51. III. p53.
52. III. p171.
53. III. p184.
54. III. pp188-189.
55. III. p190.
56. III. p190.
57. III. p53.
58. III. p77.
59. III. p50.
60. III. p77.
61. III. p76.
62. III. pp71-72.
63. III. p52.
64. III. p54.
65. III. p43.
66. III. p 52.
67. III. p190.
68. III. p64.
69. III. p65.
70. III. p65.
71. III. p68.
72. III. p59.
73. III. p50.

## CHAPTER SIX

74. III, p41.

75. III, p56.

76. III, p75.

77. III, 63.

78. Edward Goy, "Existence and Symbol: Nature in Seobe I and II", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, p52.

79. III, p76.

80. III, p74.

81. III, p165.

82. IV, p87.

83. IV, p137.

84. IV, p272.

85. IV, p273.

86. IV, p389.

87. IV, p390.

88. IV, p390.

89. IV, p390.

90. IV, p390.

91. IV, p72.

92. IV, p265.

93. IV, p265.

94. IV, p80.

95. V, p73.

96. V, p72.

97. V, p74.

98. John G. Gunnell, Political Philosophy and Time, Wesleyan University Press, 1968, p27.



## CHAPTER SIX

99. Mircea Eliade, Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return, Harper and Row, New York, 1959, p123.

100. IV, p268.

101. IV, p269.

102. IV, p45.

103. IV, p46.

104. IV, p46.

105. IV, p49.

106. V, p103, p212.

107. V, p196.

108. V, p177.

109. V, p182.

110. IV, p164.

111. IV, p202.

112. IV, p190.

113. Christopher Norris, Deconstruction: Theory and Practice, Methuen, London, 1982, p47.

114. Christopher Norris, p47.

115. V, p464.

116. I, p153.

117. V, p219.

118. V, p286.

119. V, p276.

120. IV, p273.

121. V, p203.

122. IV, p38.

123. IV, p394.

124. IV, p436.

## CHAPTER SIX

125. IV, p436.

126. IV, p461.

127. V, p478.

128. V, pp483-484.

129. V, p465.

130. V, p484.

131. V, p485.

132. Nikola Milošević, p224.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study examines the representation of time and analyses its significance in Crnjanski's four major novels. We began by examining the issue of time as discussed by Crnjanski in his two early essays "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" and "Za slobodni stih" (1). In those essays he emphasises the role played by the two principles of simultaneity and rhythm. They are introduced in this investigation as features of Crnjanski's personal style known as sumatraism, and against the background of the Serbian and European modernist aesthetic of which they form a part. Crnjanski links these principles to language and the self. Language must reflect in its very form the ideas which it represents in order to achieve a greater immediacy of expression. Simultaneity and rhythm are inner processes experienced by the individual, and which link the individual to experience and the world. In Part Two of this study we examined the link between time and language, taking language to mean not only syntax and sentence structure, but also all aspects of narrative structure. In Part Three we examined the relationship between time and self, and between time and

self in history. We shall begin the concluding remarks by summarising the opinions of those critics who have commented on time in Crnjanski's novels. The results of this study lead to the conclusion that the impression which other commentators give of time in his novels needs to be qualified. The conclusion proceeds to re-assess their views on the basis of the arguments put forward in the preceeding chapters.

Those critics who have commented on time in Crnjanski's novels are generally agreed on the nature of time and temporal structure in his novels. Milošević refers to Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću as "zatvoren krug" ("a closed circle" 2), since he sees no substantial difference in the outlook of the diarist from beginning to end of the novel. Petković describes the composition of Seobe, with its repetitions of certain phrases and sentences at its beginning and end, as "zatvorena kompozicija koja je po tipu prstenasta" ("a closed composition which is ring-like" 3). He later combines this feature of the novel with the fates of the characters themselves, stating that the two elements when taken together produce the effect of "strukturni prsten" ("a structural ring" 4). Vučković offers a similar suggestion in his remarks on Druga knjiga seoba. He considers that the final section of the novel "zatvara prsten" ("closes a ring" 5). That ring encompasses the years 1752-1753, the many years which

follow rapidly in the last chapter of the book, and the novel's multiple layers of meaning in one artistic structure.

With reference to time within the novels, commentators have tended to agree on its complexity. Glišić remarks on the way in which Crnjanski substitutes the weaving together of multiple temporal layers for linear chronology in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću (6). Petković describes the representation of time in Seobe as one "koje se lako razvija u oba pravca, napred i nazad, a zna za nagle prekide i asocijativne skokove" ("which easily develops in both directions, forward and back, and acknowledges sudden ruptures and associative leaps" 7). Zorić, again on Seobe, discusses the contest between the subjective, psychological time of Vuk and the objective, neutral time of history (8). Kalajić regards Rjepnin's frequent recollections of his past and youth in Roman o Londonu as indicative of a trend in Crnjanski's novels generally. He describes this trend as "trajna konstanta dela Crnjanskog, čija forma mentis očigledno pripada jednom cikličnom, organskom shvatanju sveta, a ne linearnom i evolucionističkom" ("a constant feature of Crnjanski's work, whose forma mentis evidently belongs to a cyclic, organic understanding of the world, and not a linear or evolutionary one" 9).

In his discussion of Seobe, Zorić concludes

that Crnjanski is recognised as a modern writer by the "trijumf vremena nad čovekom" ("triumph of time over man" 10). Other critics agree with Zorić on this point, although not explicitly. Džadžić in his book Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog emphasises the role played by what he describes as spaces of bliss which function as refuges from time, and the inevitability of death:

Prostori sreće ograđeni su zaštitnim omotačem od nasilja i destrukcija vremena, od hoda smrti (11).

The Spaces of Bliss are enclosed by a protective shell from the violence and destruction of time, from the march of death.

Džadžić establishes a view of time which is external to the characters, and which in its wake brings inevitable death. However, in his novels Crnjanski presents time as a way of ordering experience which is formulated by the characters themselves, and by other agencies.

These remarks on time in Crnjanski's novels are made within the course of more extensive articles or books not devoted to the single theme of time. As such, they are not developed, but they indicate the general tenor of opinion on the subject. This investigation is the first long work devoted to the analysis of time in Crnjanski's novels. The arguments presented in this study demonstrate the complexity of time in Crnjanski's novels. However, the complexity of time is derived from the role which the characters play in formulating

temporal relationships. Time does not completely triumph over man. Finally, the impression that time in his novels is in some way comparable to a circular or ring-like structure suggests that each novel offers a complete cycle of time. However, time functions on many levels in Crnjanski's work, and that is one sign of his modernity.

Time in Crnjanski's novels is characterised by the twin principles of rhythm and simultaneity, as discussed in Chapter Two of this study. Simultaneity is a quasi-mystical experience in which the subject feels integrated into a wider unity. In the immediate experience of the moment all contact with temporal divisions of duration and succession is suppressed, and the individual is not separated from experience by the categories of past, present, and future. The invisible threads which link together events and experiences separated in time and space are illuminated, and the subject becomes part of a totality in an eternal present. The moment is characterised by a dominant mood. Crnjanski expresses this totality in his essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" in the phrase "kako je sve u vezi, na svetu" ("how everything is in connection in this world" 12). Critics have emphasised the role of simultaneity, or "veza", in sumatraism as an expression of a direct and intuitive bond which links the subject directly to experience. They have regarded it as the

"osnovna nit" of his philosophy, which offers a sense of harmony for the subject in a fragmented world (13). However, in his "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" Crnjanski records that he repeats the word sumatra "podrugljivo" ("mockingly" 14) to himself. The experience of simultaneity which he is describing is thus qualified with an ironic tone.

The irony is justified by Crnjanski's other principle of temporal organisation, rhythm. Rhythm differs from simultaneity in that it is an order of experience which emphasises change. Its focus falls on the transition from one event to another, and as such it produces an alternative order of time. The changes are recorded as an inner process in what Crnjanski terms the "tačan ritam duševnih potresa" ("precise rhythm of spiritual quakes" 15). Each moment of change signals a rupture with a previous moment, but the previous moment does not disappear. Past and present function in parallel as Crnjanski describes in Itaka i komentari. "Prošlost i sadašnjost trče tako kao dva klovna, paralelno, ali se više nikad sastati neće" ("The past and present run like two clowns, in parallel, but they will never meet again" 16). The principles are not antithetical, and in a non-mechanistic and non-progressive view of temporal organisation they are complementary notions of a search for intrasience within transience. Each new moment is invested with an



origin, linked to but not equal to all previous moments. Rhythm is a vital process which links together what would otherwise be the fragmented moments of simultaneity, reformulating the past in terms of the present. Rhythm introduces a sense of historical thinking into Crnjanski's simultaneity.

The complexity of Crnjanski's outlook on time begins with his use of language. In Chapter Three we examined ways in which he transgresses the normative rules of syntax by, for example, delaying or omitting verbs, and using language more common to the spoken rather than the written variant. By these and other means he breaks the link between time as the index of change and action as the expression of that change, reformulating the representation of time as an expression of characters and narrating voices. The temporal organisation of Dnevik o Čarnojeviću is a reflection of the diarist's consciousness, one feature of which is the belief that all action is useless since everything is ultimately confined to an irrecoverable past. Hence, Rajić, as the personification of the diarist in memory never surfaces in the present of writing. The significance of the diarist's memory is repressed. Vuk, Dafina and Arandel in Seobe consider the past of their relationships from very different perspectives, and with different aims for the future. Time is not presented as a total structure. Each

character organises the events of the novel in ways which highlight the significance of events differently. The impression is given of time as a series of competing structures, fragmented amongst the characters.

While his style and use of language is a consistent feature of his novels, there is a development in the complexity of voice. In Chapter Four we examined the way in which his two final novels, Druga knjiga seoba and Roman o Londonu rely on voice for their compositional coherence in relation to time. Each voice is situated at a different point in time in relation to the events which it describes, and narrates the events with different emphases on their sequence and duration. In Druga knjiga seoba there is a conflict between time as conceived by Pavle and time as conceived by the institutions which he serves. Pavle has a certain view of history, of his place within that history, and of the place of the Serbian nation, which is at odds with the demands of the empires which he serves, and with the emerging European culture with which he feels no affinity. Rjepnin, in Crnjanski's last novel, Roman o Londonu, is also in conflict with the dominant culture surrounding him in post-war London. However, the emphasis in this novel falls on the conflicting voices within him. They offer various ways in which he is able to organise and reflect on his past, present, and future. These inner voices, as in Dnevnik o

Čarnojeviću, are personified as his dead friend Barlov, and Jim and John.

By minimising the role of action as the index of change, and emphasising the role played by characters in constructing temporal relationships, Crnjanski denies time as a neutral or natural order of experience and makes of time an expression of the values held by the characters. Different characters and voices arrange their interpretation of events in a way which exposes their fears, hopes, and desires. "Ne postoje nepromenljive vrednosti" ("Unchanging values do not exist 17). remarks Crnjanski in his essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'". Values change as effects and expressions of the multiple time schemes created by the characters. The conclusion to be drawn from Crnjanski's representation of time as discussed in Chapters Three and Four is that time is a framework within which the characters formulate their views of self and of self in history. Crnjanski's use of language and narrative structure projects the characters as the creators of temporal schemes, as they attempt to capture for themselves meaning, purpose, and identity in time. Time is a central feature of Crnjanski's novels, and its complexity is based on the view of time as an inner process, which structures the relationship between character and experience. The effect of Crnjanski's use of language disrupts the linear, progressive flow of

time as the order of experience, and time assumes transcendental, psychological, and ontological significance for his characters.

The link between time, self and history is pursued in Chapters Five and Six of this study. For both the diarist in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću and Rjepnin in Roman o Londonu there is no meaning in the transience of the present, and memory reveals the past as an irrecoverable time, thus there is a struggle to define a sense of self as being-in-time. However, they reflect on the present and on their memories differently. Čarnojević seeks a solution in the creation of another figure, the sailor. He is a dream figure who transcends the repressed past, as personified by Rajić. The sailor bridges the gap between past and present, and negates the fears and anxieties aroused by the future. Rjepnin overcomes the gap between his image of his self in the past and his image of self in the present by surrendering to illusion. The sense of illusion is reinforced by the numerous references to the stage motif, and his own function as the narrator, such that he is both victim and witness to the events. He begins to consider his actions as if performed by an actor. He assumes the identity of who he once was, and the strength of the illusion is such that he is able to face death as a symbolic mode of recovery of his former identity.

Both main characters of these two novels are in

search of salvation, which is represented by their desire for self. They are presented as unstable subjects, such that they are not consistently recognised as "I" or "he". Time is the structure of consciousness which makes of memory, will, and desire temporal structures, through which the characters negotiate their way towards a sense of their true selves, their authentic being-in-time. The self and so time is under constant transformation. The sense of being which is intransient and fixed in an enclosed moment of simultaneity dissolves and is reformulated during the course of Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću. The mood of resignation which dominates much of the novel is transformed at the end into a suggestion of defiance with the closing words: "Ali ako umrem, pogledaću poslednji put nebo, utehu moju, i smešiću se" ("But if I die, I shall take one last look at the sky, my comfort, and I shall smile" 18). In Roman o Londonu Rjepnin's efforts to remove all trace of self in time by his suicide is the result of this fluidity of time in which he can find no sense of self. Time becomes the site at which the characters struggle for identity, and as such time is not entirely outside their control. Time is thus not passive, but an active element in the characters' concepts of being-in-time.

Time does not only provide a structure of consciousness for Crnjanski's characters. In Seobe

and Druga knjiga seoba, the characters search for a sense of being-in-time, but their search is expressed in relation to conflicting views on time and the values which time represents. Time in Seobe is represented in symbolic form. The star and Russia appear to Vuk as powerful and compelling symbols of a utopian future where he will live his life as a Serb. These symbols are underpinned for him by the promise of his father that the Serbs will return home as victorious soldiers. However, as that promise becomes impossible to fulfil, the symbols are transformed and ready to accept new meanings. Vuk is able to create and reformulate his own position within past, present and future by imposing and manipulating the symbols of being-in-time with which he identifies. Thus, the promise of the father becomes for Vuk a promise that he too can become the father. The meanings of the symbols are bound by the military tradition, the national religion, and the patriarchal culture in which he lives. He is able to bring to bear on the chaos of experience a cultural code, from which his wife, Dafina, is excluded. Vuk is able to consider his self as part of regenerative cycles, whereas, significantly, Dafina's destiny is considered as continual decay until death. She is submitted to the flow of time represented by the river, in which she symbolically drowns. She has no control over events, time, or images of self, and is excluded from the

discourse which opens up the psychological, transcendental, and ontological significance of time consciousness.

Petković's view that the composition of Seobe is closed and ring-like minimises the point that the dominant model of time as represented by Vuk Isaković is regenerative. Thus, the motif of return, which is evident in all Crnjanski's novels, becomes a central motif in Seobe. Vuk's return after a year away at the war is a return to the power to reformulate his consciousness of time. There is co-existence between the principles of simultaneity and rhythm. The symbols of the past and of memory have not been lost, but adapted to new conditions. However, the links which Vuk forges with the culture and history of his day are themselves contingent and open to change. In Seobe, time is not only demonstrated as an integral part of consciousness, but also as a symbolic form which is determined by the cultural conditions of the day.

Pavle in Druga knjiga seoba comes into contact with wider spheres of temporal organisation, each of which imposes its own organisation of events on the novel, layering the events with various values and meanings. Pavle is linked to the past in two distinct ways. He has a view of time in which the past is irrecoverable and the future is uncertain. This view was examined as an effect of psychological time, in

which Pavle feels isolated from value and the meaning of his life. However, his epic consciousness of time offers him a sense of unity between self, nature, society, and the nation. Change is not acknowledged, and past, present, and future are linked in a single moment in which meaning is self-present. His intransient image of time is founded on the national myth of Kosovo. Pavle's search is for the eternal repetition of this intransience of being, which rejects authentic being-in-time as becoming. Pavle's two approaches to time are not resolved, and he remains divided between the culturally shaped moment of epic consciousness, and the recognition of change in psychological time.

However, Pavle is also described in the novel by other narrating voices who cast him in different roles. He is viewed against the changes in European consciousness and culture of the mid-eighteenth century and their influence on him. Pavle is being forced to abandon his Serbian identity, and serve alien interests. The immediate period of the mid-eighteenth century gives way to wider descriptions of the epoch as the beginning of the historical period which has led to today (19). These broader spheres of historical time, function in parallel with the inner processes by which Pavle reflects on his being-in-time. They are in tension, and cannot be resolved into a single structure of time.



The motif of return and the impression of time characterised by the principle of simultaneity suggest that Crnjanski's novels are dominated by a cyclic view of time. The critics whose comments were quoted at the beginning of these concluding remarks imply a certain view of cyclic time in their suggestion of a closure which links the ends of the novels to their beginnings. However, in Crnjanski's novels time has numerous forms, which are the effects and expressions of consciousness and culture. There are moments in which the mood of the character is an apprehension of the invisible bonds which link the self to different times, and which illuminate a sense of self. However, the effect is itself transient. The fragmented moments have a common bond in the rhythms which hold them in uncertain connection in each novel. By formulating experience within the confines of their desired salvation, based on the values which give them purpose, Crnjanski's characters draw towards a solution to the alienation which they feel from the wider historical and social process. But, in doing so, they each inscribe themselves into personal histories which isolate themselves from others. Such is the fate between Vuk, Dafina, and Arandel in Seobe, between Pavle and the Europe of his day in Druga knjiga seoba, and between Rjepnin and London. The characters are also viewed as divided within themselves in their attempts to realise a

sense of being-in-time, as is the case for the diarist in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću. Time remains as the structure which divides the subject from the world and meaning, and the only structure through which they can be re-united.

Time does not completely triumph in Crnjanski's novels, rather there is a varied and multiple relationship between any one character and time. His characters are the creators of temporal schemes of repetition, regeneration, death and rebirth, and are subject to the temporal schemes of other agencies. As a human construction time has no stability outside the psychological, ontological, transcendental, and social demands which define its mode of existence at any one moment. It is a fluid structure characterised by the twin principles of simultaneity and rhythm. The significance of time in Crnjanski's novels is as the site at which to explore the struggle between the conflicting inner desires of the characters and their relationship to experience and the world. Simultaneity as a mood in the eternal present is open to the rhythms of change, and each change offers a potential origin to recover a sense of being-in-time. There is no resolution offered to the various effects of simultaneity and rhythm in Crnjanski's four major novels. The complexity of time in his novels is determined by the indivisibility of the two principles.

Crnjanski himself defines this indivisibility when proclaiming his sumatraist project in his essay "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'" as one attempting to express the "promenljivi ritam raspoloženja" ("unstable rhythm of mood") and the "ritam svakog raspoloženja" ("rhythm of each mood" 20).

Notes

1. "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'", I, pp207-214.  
"Za slobodni stih", XII, pp7-14.
2. Nikola Milošević, Roman Miloša Crnjanskog: Problem univerzalnog iskaza, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1970, p94.
3. Novica Petković, Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 1985, p13.
4. Novica Petković, p92.
5. Radovan Vučković, "Osnovne crte simbolike i strukture romana Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Književne analize, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Sarajevo, 1972, p128.
6. Slobodanka Glišić, "Moć i nemoć erotskog", Delo, 1977, XXIII, 11, p5.
7. Novica Petković, p92.
8. Pavle Zorić, "Struktura poetske proze Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp229-230.
9. Dragoš Kalajić, "Roman o Londonu i Evropu", Delo, 1972, XVIII, 5, p576.
10. Pavle Zorić, p230.
11. Petar Džadžić, Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog, Nolit, Belgrade, 1976, p18.
12. I, p214.
13. Dragiša Vitošević, "Miloš Crnjanski i posleratna avangarda", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, p29.
14. I, p214.
15. XII, p12.
16. I, p168.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

- 17. I, p210.
- 18. II, p90.
- 19. IV, p260.
- 20. I, p210.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography contains three sections. The first section concerns works by Crnjanski, the second section lists secondary sources, and the third gives supplementary sources relevant to this study of time in Crnjanski's novels. There have been two lengthy bibliographies of Crnjanski's works and of criticism on his work. The first is an extensive bibliography covering Crnjanski's own work, commentaries, and translations, and the second refers specifically to his poetry:

Kostić, Stanka, and Ružica Stojković, Marija Ševković, "Bibliografija Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp341-428.

Kostić, Stanica, and Branislava Popović, "Bibliografija poezije Miloša Crnjanskog", Miloš Crnjanski, Sabrane pesme, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1978, pp359-407.

A third bibliography which is particularly useful for material relating to Serbian modernism and Crnjanski is:

Tešić, Gojko, "Bibliografija radova o međuratnoj srpskoj književnosti", Međuratna srpska književnost, edited by Marko Nedić, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IX, Belgrade, 1983, pp233-330.

These bibliographical sources have been supplemented by bibliographical searches in the libraries of Nottingham University, School of Slavonic and East European Studies in London University, British Library, Serbian Academy

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

of Arts and Sciences, and the National Library of Serbia in Belgrade. Archive materials held by the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Miloš Crnjanski Foundation in the National Library of Serbia have also been consulted. However, the archive materials are almost entirely made up of personal letters which have no bearing on this thesis.

Two collections of essays on Crnjanski's life and works have been published:

Palavestra, Predrag, and Svetlana Radulović, eds., Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972

Norris, David, ed., Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988.

Three editions of the Belgrade journal Delo also contain collections of essays dedicated to Crnjanski: Delo, 1978, XXIV, 5, pp1-88; 1984, XXX, 3, pp1-104; 1987, XXXIII, 5-6, pp132-203. Editions of two other journals also have been partly devoted to Crnjanski's life and works: Gradina, 1979, XIV, 5, pp5-26; Relations, 1981, 3-4, pp9-48. Essays from these collections are listed individually under the relevant sections of this bibliography.

WORKS BY MILOŠ CRNJANSKI

A comprehensive list of Crnjanski's works is included in the 1972 bibliography of Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog. References to autobiographical essays and to works published since 1972 have been given in the notes to Chapter One of this thesis. This section lists a) the 1983 edition of the collected works of Miloš Crnjanski, b) other works not included in this collection excluding essays and other shorter items, c) first publications of the four novels and two essays which form the primary material for this study of time in Crnjanski's novels. In the 1983 edition volume III contains Seobe, and volumes IV and V Druga knjiga seoba.

a)

Crnjanski, Miloš, Izabrana dela, Nolit, Belgrade, 1983

- I Pesme
- II Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću i druga proza
- III Seobe I
- IV Seobe II
- V Seobe III
- VI Kod Hyperborejaca I
- VII Kod Hyperborejaca II
- VIII Roman o Londonu I
- IX Roman o Londonu II
- X Drame



XI Putopisi

XII Eseji

XIII Embahade I-III

XIV Embahade IV

b)

Crnjanski, Miloš (written under the pseudonym Johnsson, Harald), Podzemni klub, Napredak, Pančevo, 1921, (republished in instalments in Politika, 12 February to 12 March 1985, and in a xerox copy by Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Belgrade, 1985)

Crnjanski, Miloš, Kap španske krvi, Nolit, Belgrade, 1970, (first serialised in Vreme, 15 March to 17 April 1932, 24 to 29 April 1932)

Crnjanski, Miloš, Suzni krokodil, Srpski književni glasnik, 1931, XXXII, 1, pp26-34; 2, pp107-118; 3, pp189-198; 4, pp265-277

Crnjanski, Miloš, Sveti Sava, Zadruga Profesorskog društva, Belgrade, 1934

Crnjanski, Miloš, Knjiga o Mikelandelu, Nolit, Belgrade, 1981

c)

Crnjanski, Miloš, Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, Izdanje Sveslovenske knjižarnice M. J. Stefanovića, Belgrade, 1921

Crnjanski, Miloš, Seobe, Knjižara Gece Kona, Belgrade, 1929, (first serialised in Srpski književni glasnik, 1927, XXII, 7, pp481-488; 8, pp561-577; 1928, XXIII, 1, pp161-172; 4, pp252-262; 5, pp321-337; 6, pp401-409; 7, pp489-502; 8, pp568-578; 1929, XXIV, 1, pp16-28; 2, pp97-105; 3, pp178-182; 4, pp249-261)

Crnjanski, Miloš, Seobe i Druga knjiga seoba, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1962

Crnjanski, Miloš, Roman o Londonu, Nolit, Belgrade, 1971

Crnjanski, Miloš, "Objašnjenje 'Sumatre'", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, I, 4, pp265-270

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Crnjanski, Miloš, "Za slobodni stih", Misao, 1922,  
VIII, 4, pp282-287

SECONDARY SOURCES

The first part of this section contains references which relate specifically to Crnjanski's novels. The second part contains references to general commentaries on his work. These general commentaries include references to his poetry, other prose works, sumatraism, and Serbian modernism, which have been relevant to this study of time in his novels. They provide a broader context to the study of time in Crnjanski's novels, to his personal sumatraist style, and to his place in Serbian literature of the twentieth century. The third part of this section contains references to biographical items and interviews. Items which are too short to be of any significance have been omitted, for example, this bibliography does not list all the short reviews of his novels, and the dedications which appeared after his death in memoriam.

Commentaries on the Novels of Miloš Crnjanski

- Bogdanović, Milan, "Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe", Srpski književni glasnik, 1929, XXVIII, 4, pp293-299, (republished with some revision as: "Seobe", Književnost između dva rata I, edited by Jovan Hristić, Srpska književnost u književnoj kritici, vol 7, Nolit, Belgrade, 1965, pp242-257)
- Dedinac, Milan, "Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću od Miloša Crnjanskog, Putevi, 1922, 1, pp29-32
- Deretić, Jovan, "Međuratni poetski roman (Rani Crnjanski, Rastko Petrović, i dr.)", Srpski roman 1800-1950, Nolit, Belgrade, 1981, pp250-286
- Dražković, Aleksandar, "Lament nad sudbinom", Gradina, 1978, XIII, 2, pp28-34
- Džadžić, Petar, Prostori sreće u delu Miloša Crnjanskog, Nolit, Belgrade, 1976
- Džadžić, Petar, "The Non-Causal System of Links in the Novels of M. Crnjanski", Relations, 1981, 3-4, pp17-27
- Glišić, Slobodanka, "Moć i nemoć erotskog", Delo, 1977, XXIII, 11, pp5-32
- Glišić, Slobodanka, "Erotski motivi u romanu Miloša Crnjanskog", Gradina, 1979, XIV, 3, pp13-23
- Glušćević, Zoran, "Roman jednog naciona. Miloš Crnjanski Seobe i Druga knjiga seoba, SKZ, Beograd, 1962", Književne novine, 14 December 1962, p3
- Goy, Edward, "Existence and Symbol: Nature in Seobe I and II", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp47-59
- Hawkesworth, Celia, "Distancing Devices in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću, Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp35-45
- Hronjec, Vičezoslav, "Da li je Miloš Crnjanski napisao roman Podzemni klub", Književne novine, 1 November 1986, p18
- Hronjec, Vičezoslav, "Odgovor Mirjani Popović-Radović", Književne novine, 15 January 1987, p2. (published as a letter)

- Ignjatović, Dragoljub, "Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću ili nihilizam kao upozorenje", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp75-92
- Ignjatović, Srba, "The All-Inclusive Form of Crnjanski", Relations, 1981, 3-4, pp39-44
- Ijar, Šarl, "Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Savremenik, 1971, XVII, 3, pp209-213
- Il'yina, G. Ya., "Liricheski mir Milosha Tsrnyanskovo", Razvitiye yugoslavskovo romana v 20-30-e gody XX v., Nauka, Moscow, 1985, pp34-59
- Ivanović, Radomir, "Roman o otuđenju i samootuđenju", Stremljenja, 1973, XIV, 1, pp53-78
- Jeremić, Dragan, "Roman Miloša Crnjanskog, ili prevaziđenja suprotnosti između poezije i istorije", Književne novine, 1 August 1972, p3 and p14
- Ješić, Nedeljko, "Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe i Druga knjiga seoba, SKZ, Beograd, 1962", Stremljenja, 1963, IV, 2, pp193-196
- Ješić, Nedeljko, "Koje izdanje Dnevnika o Čarnojeviću je 'pravo'?", Letopis Matice srpske, 1987, 439, 2, pp276-293
- Jevtić, Borivoje, "G. Crnjanski: psiholog gomila (Seobe, Geca Kon, Beograd, 1929)", Pregled, 1929, III, 70, pp210-213
- Kalajić, Dragoš, "Roman o Londonu i Evropu", Delo, 1972, XVIII, 5, pp571-584
- Kalezić, Vasilije, "Uz književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog", Književnost i jezik, 1961, VIII, 1, pp20-27
- Kašanin, Milan, "Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe. Roman. Beograd. 1929 (Izdanje G. Kona)", Letopis Matice srpske, 1929, 320, 2, pp147-148
- Koljević, Svetozar, "Ruski London (Miloš Crnjanski: Roman o Londonu, Nolit, Beograd, 1971.)", Savremenik, 1972, XVIII, 6, pp572-575
- Koljević, Svetozar, "Violation as Innocence", Relations, 1981, 3-4, pp11-16

Koljević, Svetozar, "Silovanje kao nevinost - jezička pometnja u Romanu o Londonu", Književne novine, 21 January 1982, p10 and p11

Koljević, Svetozar, "The Linguistic Aspects of the International Theme in Roman o Londonu, Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp75-87

Konstantinović, Radomir, "Poetski humor Crnjanskog. Povodom Seoba i Dnevnika o Čarnojeviću u izdanju Minerve 1956", Književne novine, 22 July 1956, p5

Korać, Stanko, Srpski roman između dva rata 1918-1941, Nolit, Belgrade, 1982, ("Miloš Crnjanski: Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću /1921/, pp77-107; "Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe /1929/", pp182-216; "Miloš Crnjanski: Suzni krokodil /1931/", pp236-244; Miloš Crnjanski: Kap španske krvi /1932/, pp245-251)

Kordić, Siniša, "M. Crnjanski: Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću (Beograd, Sveslovenska knjižara, 1921)", Svetski Pregled, 1921, I, 8, pp12-13

Kovač, Nikola, "Sudbina 'raseljenih lica': Roman o Londonu Miloša Crnjanskog", Delo, 1984, XXX, 3, pp40-51

Kovač Zvonko, "Antinomije i fragmenti Dnevnika o Čarnojeviću", Delo, 1987, XXXIII, 5-6, pp152-173

Ladan, Tomislav, "Od historije do poezije i natrag. Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe I i II, izd. SKZ, Beograd, 1962", U Škarama, Znanje, Zagreb, 1965, pp95-100

Leovac, Slavko, Romansijer Miloš Crnjanski, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1981

Leovac, Slavko, "Istorija u romanima Miloša Crnjanskog", Savremenik, 1982, XXVIII, 1-2, pp55-64

Lompar, Milo, "Imperatrix Abscondita", Savremenik, 1984, XXX, 1-2, pp125-143

Lompar, Milo, "Ime Pavela Isakovića", Delo, 1987, XXXIII, 5-6, pp191-203

Lončar, Mate, "Poetsko buđenje prošlosti, Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe i Druga knjiga seoba, Beograd, SKZ, 1962", Život, 1963, XII, 3, pp87-97

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Lovrić, Jasmina, "Funkcija interpunkcije u Crnjanskoj prozi", Delo, 1978, XXIV, 5, pp67-72
- Maraković, Ljubomir, "Novi romani. (M. Crnjanski: Seobe, Beograd, 1929)", Hrvatska prosvjeta, 1929, XVI, 5, pp113-116; 6, pp140-143
- Marković, M., "Ep o Srbiji. Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe i Druga knjiga seoba", Gledišta, 1964, XI, 1-2, pp90-94
- Marković, Slobodan, "Ljubav kao merilo ljudske sreće u Seobama Miloša Crnjanskog", Stremljenja, 1970, XI, 4, pp419-428
- Maticki, Miodrag, "Graničarska epika u Seobama Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp197-207
- Milić, Novica, "Kako čitati Seobe", Književna reč, 25 December 1983, p17
- Milić, Novica, "Kako se zvao Čarnojević?", Književna reč, 10 February 1987, p6
- Milidragović, Božidar, "Čitajući roman o Londonu. Najnovije delo Miloša Crnjanskog", Borba, 20 November 1971, p8
- Milošević, Nikola, "Filozofska dimenzija književnih dela Miloša Crnjanskog", Miloš Crnjanski, Sabrana dela Miloša Crnjanskog, vol 1, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1966, pp9-116
- Milošević, Nikola, Roman Miloša Crnjanskog: Problem univerzalnog iskaza, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1970
- Milošević, Nikola, "Metafizički vid stvaralaštva Miloša Crnjanskog", Zidanica na pesku: Književnost i metafizika, Slovo ljubve, Belgrade, 1978, pp7-58
- Mladenović, Slobodan, "Miloš Crnjanski. Seobe", Susret sa književnim delima naših savremenika, Radnički universitet, Leskovac, 1971, pp37-49
- Nedić, Marko, "Stari roman Miloša Crnjanskog. M. Crnjanski: Kap španske krvi", Letopis Matice srpske, 1971, 407, 4, pp450-454
- Nedić, Marko, "Roman o usamljenosti (uz Roman o Londonu Miloša Crnjanskog)", Književnost, 1973, XXVIII,

2, pp208-213

- Nikolić, Berislav, "Jezik u Seobama Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp235-245
- Norris, David A., "Time in Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću: Structural and Thematic Features, Relations, 1985, 3, pp67-76; 4, pp55-63, (translated and republished as: Norris, David A., "Vreme u Dnevniku o Čarnojeviću: Strukturalne i tematske odlike", Delo, 1987, XXXIII, 5-6, pp174-190)
- Norris, David A., "Epic and Time in Miloš Crnjanski's Novel Druga knjiga seoba", The Slavonic and East European Review, 66, 2, 1988, pp224-235
- Norris, David A., "Contrasting Temporal Organisation in Crnjanski's Novels", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp89-101
- Novaković, Boško, "Zapis o Seobama", Letopis Matice srpske, 1963, 342, 6, pp506-526
- Palavestra, Predrag, "Roman epohe raseljenih lica. Miloš Crnjanski: Roman o Londonu, Beograd, Nolit, 1971", Politika, 27 November 1971, p14
- Palavestra, Predrag, "Pesnički roman Miloša Crnjanskog", Gradina, 1981, XV, 2, pp5-15
- Palavestra, Predrag, "The Utopian Poetic Consciousness of Miloš Crnjanski", Relations, 1981, 3-4, pp28-32
- Pervić, Muharem, et al, "Razgovor o romanu Seobe u redakciji časopisa Delo", Delo, 1963, IX, 1, pp1-28
- Pervić, Muharem, "Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Treći program, 1977, 33, pp241-271
- Pervić, Muharem, "Pesnik romana: Miloš Crnjanski: Seobe", Pripovedanje i mišljenje: Vidovi savremenog jugoslovenskog romana, Srpska književna zadruza, Belgrade, 1978, pp69-107
- Petković, Novica, Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 1985
- Petrov, Aleksandar, "Folk Tale Elements in the Second Book of Seobe, Miloš Crnjanski and Modern



- Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp61-73
- Petrović, Miodrag, "Dva romana Miloša Crnjanskog", Trajanje reči: Kritički ogledi i članci, Gradina, Niš, 1972, pp89-96
- Pijanović, Petar, "Neki aspekti kasne proze Miloša Crnjanskog", Savremenik, 1980, XXVI, 1-2, pp48-64
- Popović-Radović, Mirjana, "Citati stvarnosti u Romanu o Londonu", Delo, 1984, XXX, 3, pp58-78
- Popović-Radović, Mirjana, "Nepoznati detektivski roman Miloša Crnjanskog", Književne novine, 15 January 1985, p15
- Popović-Radović, Mirjana, "Jedini verodostojni svedok je pisac", Književne novine, 1 December 1986, p19
- Pražić, Milan, "U prostorima nepostojanja", Izraz, 1972, XVI, 6, pp587-594
- Puvačić, Dušan, "Izgnanik ili problem samoće u Romanu o Londonu", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp269-290
- Radovanović, Milorad, "Neki sintaksički postupci karakteristični za jezik knjige Roman o Londonu, Prilozi proučavanja jezika, 1974, 10, pp1-48
- Radovanović, Milorad, "Značenja i funkcije pluskamperfekta u Romanu o Londonu Miloša Crnjanskog", Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu, 1975, XVIII, 1, pp165-179
- Ristić, Marko, "Seobe", Književna politika, Rad, Belgrade, 1979, pp91-98. (first published in Politika, 15 April 1929)
- Rotar, Janez, "Čitanje romana Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Izraz, 1976, XX, 11, pp523-549; 12, pp699-726
- Simić, Radoje, "Gramatička i intonacijska struktura proznog dela Miloša Crnjanskog", Književna istorija, 1978, XI, 41, pp15-60
- Stojnić, Mila, "Tri viđenja ruske emigracije u književnosti", Književnost i jezik, 1973, XX, 1, pp1-15

- Svetovski, M., "Miloš Crnjanski: Najviše povodom Dnevnika o Čarnojeviću", Misao, 1922, X, 3, pp1449-1451
- Udovički, Ivanka, "Život i smrt u delu Crnjanskog", Savremenik, 1974, XX, 12, pp1061-1073; 1975, XXI, 1, pp43-54
- Visković, Velimir, "Seobe i njihovo mjesto u stvaralaštvu Miloša Crnjanskog", Književna istorija, 1973, V, 20, pp606-631
- Vježbicki, Jan, "Melanholične Seobe", Delo, 1984, XXX, 3, pp3-15
- Vladić, Slobodanka B., "Miloš Crnjanski's Novel Migrations (1929) and Modernism", Melbourne Slavonic Studies, 1985, 19, pp126-145
- Vučković, Radovan, "Osnovne crte simbolike i strukture romana Seobe Miloša Crnjanskog", Književne analize, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Sarajevo, 1972, pp97-129, (first published in Letopis Matice srpske, 1970, 406, 5, pp443-484)
- Vujić, Vladimir, "Seobe roman od Miloša Crnjanskog, Beograd, Geca Kon, 1929", Letopis Matice srpske, 1929, 321, 1, pp107-114
- X. Z., "Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću", Misao, 1921, VI, 2, pp158-159
- Yakovlyeva, N. B., "Milosh Tsrnyanskii", Sovremennii roman Yugoslavii, Nauka, Moscow, 1980, pp119-135
- Zbiljić, Dragoljub, "Neka odstupanja od jezičke norme u Romanu o Londonu M. Crnjanskog", Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini, 1978, XIII, pp457-466
- Zorić, Pavle, "Seobe posle trideset godina", Savremenik, 1959, V, 12, pp1218-1230
- Zorić, Pavle, "Mitovi, vrednosti, apstrakcije", Savremenik, 1966, XII, 5, pp385-398
- Zorić, Pavle, "Postojanje kao antiistorija", Književne novine, 28 September 1968, p1 and p12
- Zorić, Pavle, "Struktura poetske proze Miloša Crnjanskog", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp209-234

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ždrale, Radovan, "Crnjanske Seobe i Piščevići  
Memoari, Letopis Matice srpske, 1972, 409, 4,  
pp397-416

Živojinović-Massuka, Velimir, "Seobe Miloša  
Crnjanskog", Misao, 1929, XXIX, 7-8, pp480-486

General Commentaries

- Aleksić, Branko, "Ciklične veze Miloša Crnjanskog", Vidici, 1978, 1, pp18-19
- Bogdanović, Milan, "Nova poezija", Srpski književni glasnik, 1921, IV, 1, pp55-62
- Bogdanović, Milan, "Priče o muškom", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, I, 5, pp362-371
- Bogdanović, Milan, "Slom posleratnog modernizma", Književnost između dva rata II, edited by Jovan Hristić, Srpska književnost u književnoj kritici, vol 8, Nolit, Belgrade, 1966, pp335-348, (first published in Danas, 1934, I, 3, pp300-311)
- Bogdanović, Milan, "O srpskoj književnosti između dva rata", Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umetnosti, 1954, 301, pp25-34
- Car, Marko, "Podgrejani simbolizam", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, II, 2, pp120-123
- Damjanović, Đuro, "Semantika zaveza u poeziji Miloša Crnjanskog", Savremenik, 1979, XXV, 5, pp405-433
- Dedinac, Milan, "Ono što je živo i ono što je mrtvo", Delo, 1963, IX, 2, pp151-182
- Dimitrijević, Ivan R., "Kroz savremenu pripovetku. Humoristična pripovetka (Ivo Andrić Put Alije Đerzeleza, Miloš Crnjanski: Priče o muškom)", Misao, 1920, III, 3-4, pp1199-1204
- Donat, Branimir, "Crnjanski i književna kritika", Književna istorija, 1973, V, 20, pp693-696
- Džadžić, Petar, "Arkanska priroda 'veza' u delu Miloša Crnjanskog", Delo, 1978, XXIV, 5, pp21-29
- Finci, Eli, "Dva moderna putopisa. (Rastko Petrović: Afrika, Miloš Crnjanski: Ljubav u Toskani)", Pregled, 1930, IV, 82, pp679-683
- Flaker, Aleksandar, "Symbolism or Modernism in Slavic Literatures", Russian Literature, 1979, VII, 4, pp329-348
- Gligorić, Velibor, "Miloš Crnjanski", Kritike, Štamparija, Belgrade, 1926, pp35-39
- Goy, Edward D., "The Reception of Post-War Modernism in

- Srpski književni glasnik 1920-1928", Annali dell' Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1967. X, pp137-170
- Grbić, Dragoslav, "Poezija revolta i sloma", Savremenik, 1960, VI. 2, pp158-170
- Grčević, Franjo, "Počeci proznog lirizma Miloša Crnjanskog", Zbornik zagrebačke slavističke škole, 1976, IV, 4, pp243-250
- Ilić, Aleksandar, "Sumatraizam Miloša Crnjanskog", Raskrsnica, 1924, 2, pp49-52
- Jeremić, Dragan, "Miloš Crnjanski pesnik bez prestanka", Književne novine, 4 January 1969, p3
- Jeremić, Ljubiša, "Prošlo vreme Miloša Crnjanskog", Student, 1 January 1968, p1 and p2
- Jeremić, Ljubiša, "Kod Hyperborejaca - Putopis, uspomene, pamflet, ili roman?", Proza novog stila, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1978, pp46-75. (first published in Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp247-268)
- Kadić, Ante, "Surrealists versus Modernists in Serbian Literature", From Croatian Renaissance to Yugoslav Socialism, Mouton, The Hague, 1969, pp192-227
- Kalajić, Dragoš, "Značenja Hiperboreje", Delo, 1978, XXIV, 5, pp1-20
- Koljević, Nikola, "Tri klasike naše moderne", Život, 1982, LXII, 7-8, pp112-125
- Konstantinović, Radomir, "Pesnik pred ogledalom. Miloš Crnjanski: Itaka i komentari", Politika, 13 December 1959, p15
- Konstantinović, Radomir, "Miloš Crnjanski", Biće i jezik, vol 1, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1983, pp349-407, (first published in "Dva pesnika /M. Nastasijević i M. Crnjanski/", Treći program, 1970, 7, pp83-199)
- Kovač, Zvonko, "Fantastika, lirska proza (M. Crnjanskog)", Savremenik, 1988, XXXIV, 5, pp395-402
- Lazarević, Branko, "Staro i Novo", Srpski književni glasnik, 1921, II, 2, pp103-109

- Lazarević, Branko, "Lirika g. Crnjanskog", Srpski književni glasnik, 1921, II, 7, pp529-535
- Lazarević, Branko, "Kojim putem", Srpski književni glasnik, 1921, IV, 4, pp281-291; 5, pp355-365
- Lazarević, Branko, "Predratna i poratna pričanja", Srpski književni glasnik, 1922, V, 6, pp431-442 (printed as knjiga III); 7, pp520-532; 8, pp599-606
- Lešić, Zdenko, "Predgovor", Miloš Crnjanski, Sumatra i druge pesme, Djelatnost, Sarajevo, 1981, pp5-39
- Lešić, Zdenko, "Miloš Crnjanski", Klasici avangarde, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1986, pp177-220
- Lešić, Zdenko, "The Avantgarde Nature and Artistic Range of Crnjanski's Poetry", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp13-31
- Lončar, Mate, "Zapis o sumatraizmu M. Crnjanskog", Izraz, 1963, VII, 11, pp344-347
- Lončar, Mate, "Obzori sumatraizma", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp93-118
- Maraković, Ljubomir, "Putopisi. (M. Crnjanski: Ljubav u Toskani, Beograd, 1930), Hrvatska prosvjeta, 1930, XVII, 8, pp169-173
- Marković, Slobodan Ž., Književni pokreti i tokovi između dva svetska rata, Obelisk, Belgrade, 1970
- Marković, Slobodan Ž., "Sumatraizam", Književne pojave između dva svetska rata, Milić Rakić, Valjevo, 1982, pp46-55
- Miličić, Sibe, "Jedan izvod koji bi mogao da bude program", Srpski književni glasnik, 1920, I, 3, pp188-193
- Milić, Novica, "Susret na Sumatri", Delo, 1987 XXXIII, 5-6, pp132-151
- Milošević, Miloš M., "Od Bajrona i Branka do M. Crnjanskog", Raskrsnica, 1924, 13-14, pp55-61
- Milošević, Nikola, "Piscu u pokoju", Književne novine, 16 December 1977, p1 and p2

- Mirković, Miloslav, "Tri živa pesnika", Delo, 1972, XVIII, 7, pp904-911
- Mišić, Zoran, "O smislu i besmislu. O lirici 'mekog i nežnog štimunga', o jednoj čežnji i jednom govoru na svim jezicima sveta", Mladost, 1952, VIII, 2-3, pp113-128
- Noris, Dejvid, "Od Pandurovića do Crnjanskog", Srpski simbolizam: Tipološka proučavanja, edited by Predrag Palavestra, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Naučni skupovi, XXII, Belgrade, 1985, pp339-359
- Norris, David A., "Crnjanski's Legenda: Anatomy of a Fantastic Tale", Serbian Literary Quarterly, 1987, 3-4, pp55-65
- Palavestra, Predrag, "Jedan živi pesnik (Miloš Crnjanski: Itaka i komentari, Prosveta, Beograd, 1959; predgovor T. Mladenović)", Književne novine, 20 November 1959, p3
- Palavestra, Predrag, "Doba modernizma u srpskoj književnosti (1901-1918)", Književna istorija, 1979, XII, 45, pp129-174; 46, pp225-284; 47, pp415-450
- Palavestra, Predrag, "Pravci proučavanja međuratne srpske književnosti (1919-1941)", Međuratna srpska književnost, edited by Marko Nedić, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IX, Belgrade, 1983, pp9-57
- Palavestra, Predrag, "Miloš Crnjanski and the Serbian Avantgarde", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp3-11
- Pandurović, Sima, "Naša najnovija lirika", Misao, 1919, I, 5, pp381-393
- Petković, Novica, "Ritam Miloša Crnjanskog (in mem.)", Književna reč, 25 December 1977, p1 and p12
- Petrov, Aleksandar, Poezija Crnjanskog i srpsko pesništvo, Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1971
- Petrović, Miodrag, "Pesnik koji je tražio zavičaj", Gradina, 1978, XIII, 2, pp10-27
- Popović, Bogdan, and Slobodan Jovanović, "Čitaocima nove serije Srpskog književnog glasnika", Srpski

- književni glasnik, 1920, I, 1, pp1-4
- Redep, Draško, "Varijacije na temu Krleža i rani Crnjanski", Vojvodina stara, Kulturni centar, Novi Sad, 1970, pp149-160
- Redep, Draško, "Ekspresionizam Miloša Crnajnskog", Sunčanom stranom Vojvodine: Eseji i članci, Osvit, Subotica, 1972, pp67-79
- Ristić, Marko, "Kroz noviju srpsku književnost", Književna politika, Rad, Belgrade, 1979, pp99-111, (first published in Nova literatura, 1929, I, 7-8, pp194-196)
- Ristić, Marko, "Protiv modernističke književnosti", Književnost između dva rata II, edited by Jovan Hristić, Srpska književnost u književnoj kritici, vol 8, Nolit, Belgrade, 1966, pp349-358, (first published in Nadrealizam danas i ovde, 1932, I, 2, pp52-59)
- Ristić, Marko, "Tri mrtva pesnika", Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umetnosti, 1954, 301, pp245-316
- Rotar, Janez, "Historistička projekcija u suvremenom jugoslavenskom romanu", Književna reč, 25 February 1984, p1 and p8; 10 March 1984, p16; 25 March 1984, p18
- Sekulić, Isidora, "Nemiri u književnosti", Srpski književni glasnik, 1924, XII, 6, pp430-439
- Stanković, Milan, "Sumatraizam u lirici mladog Crnjanskog", Književnost i jezik, 1976, XXIII, 1-2, pp8-20
- Stefanović, Sv., "Uzbuna kritike i najmlađe moderne", Misao, 1921, VI, 1, pp58-67; 2, pp136-147; 3-4, pp274-284
- Sukalo, Mladen, "Kompleks đачkog doba", Delo, 1984, XXX, 3, pp52-57
- Šmitran, Stevka, "Italijanske teme i motivi u djelu Miloša Crnjanskog", Gradina, 1979, XIV, 3, pp5-12
- Šmitran, Stevka, "Miloš Crnjanski and Italy", Miloš Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988, pp125-137
- Šmitran, Stevka, Crnjanski i Mikelandelo, Bagdala,



Kruševac, 1988

Travar, Dušan, "Monolog ili dijalog. Uz jedan fragment iz M. Crnjanskog", Izraz, 1971, XV, 2-3, pp232-237

Velmar-Janković, Svetlana, "Između Srbije i Sumatre", Književnost, 1957, XII, 7-8, pp53-81, (republished in Savremenici, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1967, pp39-70)

Velmar-Janković, Svetlana, "Uz 'Lament nad Beogradom'", Književnost, 1965, XX, 1, pp3-13, (republished in Savremenici, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1967, pp71-83)

Velmar-Janković, Svetlana, "Pesnik trenutka koji nestaje", Miloš Crnjanski, Sabrane pesme, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, ppv-xxxv

Vitošević, Dragiša, "Posleratna avangarda i Miloš Crnjanski", Književno delo Miloša Crnjanskog, edited by Predrag Palavestra and Svetlana Radulović, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IV, Belgrade, 1972, pp5-53

Vučković, Radovan, Poetika hrvatskog i srpskog ekspresionizma, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1979

Vučković, Radovan, "Satirical Paradoxes", Relations, 1981, 3-4, pp33-38

Vukmirović, Mirjana, "O promuklom pevaču, o slušaocu bez sluha i o lepoj melodiji. (Miloš Crnjanski: Itaka i komentari, Beograd, 1959)", Delo, 1960, VI, 2, pp233-238

Zogović, Radovan, "Književni isljednici, i njihovi advokati", Na poprištu, Kultura, Belgrade, 1947, pp9-12

Žeželj, Mirko, "Miloš Crnjanski", Srpski književni glasnik, 1939, LVIII, 4, pp208-217; 5, pp278-286

Živković-Nikolin, Slaviša, "Motiv seoba u pesničkom delu Miloša Crnjanskog", Gradina, XIV, 3, 1979, pp24-26

Biographical Sources and Interviews

- Aleksić, Branko, "Crnjanski i Maks Ofils takmici za Lolu Montez, Književna reč, 25 December 1986, p9
- Anonymous, "Miloš Crnjanski: Naši saradnici", Misao, 1923, XII, 2, p795
- Bogdanović, Milan, "Slušaj M. Crnjanski - M. Car", Srpski književni glasnik, 1929, XXVI, 4, pp310-311
- Bunjac, Vladimir, "Pisci su dobili nov položaj" (interview), Književne novine, 16 December 1977, p3
- Bunjac, Vladimir, Dnevnik o Crnjanskom, Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod, Belgrade, 1982
- Bunjac, Vladimir, Kamenovani Crnjanski, Milić Rakić, Valjevo, 1986
- Čosić, Branimir, "U razgovoru sa g. Milošem Crnjanskim, pesnikom, pripovedačem, itd.", Deset pisaca, deset razgovora, Geca Kon, Belgrade, 1931, pp75-90
- Drenovac, Nikola, "Miloš Crnjanski", Pisci govore, Grafos, Belgrade, 1964, pp51-65
- Gligorijević, Milo, "Seobe pisca Seoba", Delo, 1978, XXIV, 5, pp77-88
- Janković Šole, Pavle, "S Milošem Crnjanskim, osamnaestog septembra sedamdeset pete" (transcription of radio broadcast), Letopis Matice srpske, 1982, 429, 4, pp731-745
- Ješić, Nedeljko, "O saradnji Miloša Crnjanskog u listu Golub i o njegovoj prvoj štampanoj pesmi 'Sudba'", Književna istorija, 1980, XIII, 49, pp151-163
- Kadić, Ante, "The Ideological Conflict between Miloš Crnjanski and Marko Ristić", Serbian Studies, 1984, IV, 2, pp41-55
- Komnenić, Milan, "Razgovor sa Crnjanskim" (interview), Delo, 1973, XIX, 10, pp1127-1138
- Krstić, Uglješa, "Beleške jednog izdavača", Savremenik, 1981, XXVII, 5, pp350-366
- Mirić, M., "O tempore, o mores!", Razlog, 1965, V,

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

7-8, pp809-817

Mirković, Milosav, "Miloš Crnjanski (1893-1977)",  
Delo, 1977, XXIII, 11, pp1-4

P. R., "Osnovana Zadužbina Miloša Crnjanskog",  
Politika, 12 December 1980, p14

Pejčić, Jovan, "Život prolazi kao što prolazi proleće,  
kao što prolazi cveće" (interview), Student, 6  
November 1973, p9

Popović, Milenko, Crnjanski između dva sveta, NIRO  
"Književne novine", Belgrade, 1984

Popović, Radovan, Život Miloša Crnjanskog, Prosveta,  
Belgrade, 1980

Popović-Radović, Mirjana, "Iz građe za Roman o  
Londonu: Avetinjski pisac romana u Londonu",  
Delo, 1984, XXX, 3, pp79-104

Puvačić, Dušan, "Crnjanski's Links with England", Miloš  
Crnjanski and Modern Serbian Literature, edited by  
David Norris, Astra Press, Nottingham, 1988,  
pp105-124

Raljević, Džemal, "Vrijeme prošlo - vrijeme sadašnje"  
(interview), Sloboda, 22 August 1966, p7

Ređep, Draško, "Onaj drugi Branko (dva razgovora sa  
Milošem Crnjanskim)", Književna reč, 25 December  
1977, p1 and p14

Srdanović-Barač, Olga, "Službovanje Miloša Crnjanskog u  
pančevačkoj gimnaziji", Zbornik Matice srpske za  
književnost i jezik, 1978, XXVI, 1, pp167-177

Stanković, Milan, "Mladi Crnjanski (fragmenti iz  
obimnijeg rada)", Koraci, 1970, V, 22-23, pp83-89

Tirnanić, Milorad, "Suviše smo bili optimisti"  
(interview), Student, 11 May 1971, p7

Tomašić, Stanko, Beogradske književne afere. Historijat  
i tekstovi polemike Crnjanski - Bogdanović od  
stupaca Vremena i Politike do rasprave pred  
Okružnim sudom, Binoza, Zagreb, 1932

Vojvodić, Rade, "A prah, sve je prah ali rumenkast. O  
slučaju i o porazu Miloša Crnjanskog. (Zapis na  
marginama)", Gradina, 1970, V, 8-9, pp50-71

Vukmanović, Ljuba, "Miloš Crnjanski o Branku, o Fruškoj

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gori, o Poeziji" (interview), Dnevnik, 31  
December 1967, p13

Vuletić, Anđelko, "U Londonu sa Milošem Crnjanskim"  
(interview), Delo, 1965, XII, 1, pp124-130

Zorić, Pavle, "Poezija se ne može pisati bez romantizma"  
(interview), Književne novine, 6 June 1970, p12

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The third section of this bibliography concerns material which is relevant to the methodological approach taken in this study of time in Crnjanski's novels, and to the historical and literary background of his career. The first part of this section contains references to general histories of Serbian and Yugoslav literatures. These works do not deal with Crnjanski directly, but they provide the background to his work and place in Serbian literature of the twentieth century. The second part contains references to general studies of modernism in Europe and North America. The third part contains references to the general study of time. The fourth part contains references relevant to the study of time in literature, and to examples of how time has been analysed in the works of other authors. The final part lists political and social historical works which provide the background to the period covered by Crnjanski's literary career in Serbia and Yugoslavia. Some of these historical studies concern the Balkans and Eastern Europe in general.

History of Serbian and Yugoslav Literatures

- Barac, Antun, A History of Yugoslav Literature, Michigan Slavic Publications, Ann Arbor, 1973
- Deretić, Jovan, Istorija srpske književnosti, Nolit, Belgrade, 1983
- Eekman, Thomas, Thirty Years of Yugoslav Literature (1945-1975), Michigan Slavic Publications, Ann Arbor, 1978
- Flaker, Aleksandar, Poetika osporavanja: Avangarda i književna ljevica, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1982
- Kadić, Ante, Contemporary Serbian Literature, Mouton, The Hague, 1964
- Košutić, Vladeta, Parnasovci i simbolisti u Srba, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Posebna izdanja, CCCXLVIII, Belgrade, 1967
- Lasić, Stanko, Sukob na književnoj ljevici 1928-1952, Liber, Zagreb, 1970
- Lukić, Sveta, Contemporary Yugoslav Literature: A Sociopolitical Approach, University of Illinois Press, 1972
- Nedić, Marko, ed., Međuratna srpska književnost, Institut za književnost i umetnost, Posebna izdanja, IX, Belgrade, 1983
- Palavestra, Predrag, Istorija moderne srpske književnosti: Zlatno doba 1892-1918, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1986
- Peleš, Gajo, Poetika suvremenog jugoslavenskog romana (1945-1961), Naprijed, Zagreb, 1966
- Popović, Bogdan, Antologija novije srpske lirike, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1911
- Skerlić, Jovan, Istorija nove srpske književnosti, S. B. Cvijanović, Belgrade, 1914
- Vitošević, Dragiša, Srpsko pesništvo 1901-1914, 2 vols, Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1975

Modernism

- Bradbury, Malcolm, and James McFarlane, eds.,  
Modernism 1890-1930, Penguin Books, Middlesex,  
1981
- Engelberg, Edward, "Space, Time, and History: Towards  
the Discrimination of Modernisms", Modernist  
Studies, I, 1, pp7-25
- Josipovici, Gabriel, The Lessons of Modernism and Other  
Essays, Macmillan, London, 1977
- Lawrence, D. H., Apocalypse, Martin Secker, London,  
1932
- Lunn, Eugene, Marxism and Modernism, Verso, London,  
1985
- Poggioli, Renato, The Theory of the Avant-Garde,  
Harvard University Press, 1981
- Schwartz, Sanford, The Matrix of Modernism: Pound,  
Eliot, and Early Twentieth-Century Thought,  
Princeton University Press, 1985
- Spender, Stephen, The Struggle of the Modern, Hamish  
Hamilton, London, 1963
- Val Baker, Denys, Little Reviews 1914-1943, George  
Allen and Unwin, London, 1943
- Weber, Robert W., "On Modernist Syntax", Essays in  
Poetics, 1988, 13, 1, pp47-62
- Wilson, Edmund, Axel's Castle: A Study in the  
Imaginative Literature of 1870-1930, Charles  
Scribner's Sons, New York, 1959

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Time

- Arendt, Hannah, Between Past and Future, Faber and Faber, London, 1961
- St Augustine, Confessions, Book XI, edited by Roy Joseph Deferrer, The Fathers of the Church, vol 21, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1966, pp327-366
- Bergson, Henri, Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness, Swan Sonnenschein, London, 1910
- Bergson, Henri, Matter and Memory, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1919
- Bergson, Henri, Mind Energy, Macmillan, London, 1920
- Bergson, Henri, An Introduction to Metaphysics, Liberal Arts Press, New York, 1955
- Eliade, Mircea, Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return, Harper and Row, New York, 1956
- Fraisse, Paul, The Psychology of Time, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1964
- Fraser, Julius Thomas, ed., The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities, Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London, 1968
- Gunnell, John G., Political Philosophy and Time, Wesleyan University Press, 1968
- Jaspers, Karl, Man in the Modern Age, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1951
- Jaspers, Karl, The Origin and Goal of History, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1953
- Jaspers, Karl, Philosophy, vol 2, University of Chicago Press, 1970
- Lewis, Wyndham, Time and Western Man, Chatto and Windus, London, 1927
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, "The Use and Abuse of History", The Complete Works, edited by Dr Oscar Levy, vol 5, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1927, pp1-100
- Vinaver, Stanislav, Problemi nove estetike: Bergsonovo učenje o ritmu, Vreme, Belgrade, 1924



Time in Literature

- Bakhtin, Mikhail, "Epic and Novel", The Dialogic Imagination, edited by Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press, 1983, pp3-40
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, "Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel", The Dialogic Imagination, edited by Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press, 1983, pp84-258
- Barthes, Roland, "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives", Image - Music - Text, Fontana, London, 1982, pp79-124
- Booth, Wayne C., The Rhetoric of Fiction, University of Chicago Press, 1983
- Buckley, Jerome Hamilton, The Triumph of Time: A Study of the Victorian Concepts of Time, History, Progress, and Decadence, Harvard University Press, 1967
- Chatman, Seymour, Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film, Cornell University Press, 1983
- Fawcner, Harald William, The Timescapes of John Fowles, Associated University Presses, London, 1983
- Frank, Joseph, "Spatial Form in Modern Literature", The Widening Gyre, Indiana University Press, 1963, pp3-62
- Freedman, Ralph, The Lyrical Novel: Studies in Herman Hesse, André Gide, and Virginia Woolf, Princeton University Press, 1963
- Freidin, Gregory, "Osip Mandelstam: The Poetry of Time (1908-1916)", California Slavic Studies, 1980, XI, pp141-186
- Genette, Gérard, Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method, Cornell University Press, 1980
- Gish, Nancy K., Time in the Poetry of T. S. Eliot: A Study in Structure and Theme, Barnes and Noble Books, Totowa, New Jersey, 1981
- Glasser, Richard, Time in French Life and Thought, Manchester University Press, 1972
- Hutchens, Eleanor N., "An Approach Through Time",

- Towards a Poetics of Fiction, edited by Mark Spilka, Indiana University Press, 1977. pp52-61
- Jakobson, Roman, Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1985
- Jechova, Hana, "Conception et fonction du temps dans le pensée théorique de Jan Mukařovský et de Roman Ingarden", Russian Literature, 1986, XX, 4, pp353-380
- Johnson, Leslie A., The Experience of Time in Crime and Punishment, Slavica, Columbus, 1985
- Kermode, Frank, The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction, Oxford University Press, 1968
- Lock, Richard, Aspects of Time in Medieval Literature, Garland Publishing, New York, 1985
- Lukacs, George, The Theory of the Novel, Merlin Press, London, 1978
- de Man, Paul, "The Rhetoric of Temporality", Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism, Methuen, London, 1983, pp187-228
- Miel, Jan, "Temporal Form in the Novel", Modern Language Notes, 1969, 84, pp916-930
- Mendilow, A. A., Time and the Novel, Peter Nevill, London, 1952
- Meyerhoff, Hans, Time in Literature, University of California Press, 1968
- Norris, Christopher, Deconstruction: Theory and Practice, Methuen, London, 1983
- Nowottny, Winifred, The Language Poets Use, Athlone Press, London, 1962
- Patrides, C. A., ed., Aspects of Time, Manchester University Press, 1976
- Petković, Novica, "Teze za temporalnu analizu", Savremenik, 1971, XVII, 5, pp395-401
- Poulet, Georges, Etudes sur le temps humain, 4 vols, Plon, Paris, 1968
- Ricoeur, Paul, Time and Narrative, vols 1 and 2, University of Chicago Press, 1984

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Spencer, Sharon, Space, Time and Structure in the Modern Novel, New York University Press, 1971
- Struk, Danylo H., "Andrievska's Concept of Round Time", Canadian Slavonic Papers, 1985, XXVII, 1, pp65-73
- Terras, V., "The Time Philosophy of Osip Mandel'shtam", Slavonic and East European Review, 1969, 47, 2, pp344-354
- Tobin, Patricia Drechsel, Time and the Novel: The Genealogical Imperative, Princeton University Press, 1978
- Todorov, Tzvetan, The Poetics of Prose, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1977
- Todorov, Tzvetan, Introduction to Poetics, Harvester Press, Brighton, 1981
- Turner, Frederick, and Ernst Poppel, "The Neural Lyre: Poetic Meter, the Brain, and Time", Poetry, 1983, 142, pp277-309
- Uspensky, Boris, A Poetics of Composition, University of California Press, 1973

Serbian and Yugoslav History

Clissold, Stephen, ed., A Short History of Yugoslavia: From Early Times to 1966, Cambridge University Press, 1966

Čubrilović, Vasa, ed., Istorija Beograda, vol 3, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1974

Dedijer, Vladimir, The Road to Sarajevo, Macgibbon & Kee, London, 1967

Jelavich, Barbara, History of the Balkans, 2 vols, Cambridge University Press, 1983

Okey, Robin, Eastern Europe 1740-1980: Feudalism to Communism, Hutchinson, London, 1982

Petrović, Michael Boro, A History of Modern Serbia, 1804-1918, 2 vols, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1976

Seton-Watson, Hugh, Eastern Europe between the Wars, 1918-1941, Cambridge University Press, 1945

Singleton, Fred, Twentieth-Century Yugoslavia, Macmillan, London, 1976

Singleton, Fred, A Short History of the Yugoslav Peoples, Cambridge University Press, 1985

Sugar, Petar F., and Ivo J. Lederer, eds., Nationalism in Eastern Europe, University of Washington Press, 1969

Wilson, Duncan, Tito's Yugoslavia, Cambridge University Press, 1979

Wolff, Robert Lee, The Balkans in our Time, Harvard University Press, 1956